

Gerald P. Barnett
 Donald P. Bartz
 Thomas Bingham, Jr.
 Elizabeth Black
 Felix E. Blum
 Robert J. Bova
 Robert L. Brown
 Gerald W. Bucklin
 John W. Buffkin, Jr.
 Patricia E. Byrne
 Howard L. Carlson
 John G. Cave
 Durward C. Cecil
 James H. Cochran
 William A. Cody
 Charles L. Coffman
 Eugene T. Connors
 James W. Cornwell
 James W. David
 Ralph O. Davis
 Duane D. DeWitt
 Charles A. Duffy
 Alan R. Cunningham
 Joseph F. Dunn
 Alfred C. Eastman III
 Hugo L. Ecklund, Jr.
 Richard E. Engel
 Edward J. Fagan
 Claud B. Fallis, Jr.
 Donald P. Frei
 Francis C. Gehres
 John E. Gilbertson
 Forrest D. Goetschius
 Robert L. Grappi
 William R. Grayson
 Wilbur E. Greenleaf
 William A. Gureck
 Lloyd W. Hodges
 Neil G. Holt
 Robert E. Holt
 Frank J. Horstmann
 James R. Hughes
 Edmund W. Ingley
 Maurice M. Johnston, Jr.
 John E. Jones
 Willie M. Jones, Jr.
 James T. Kearns
 Allan Kvello

SUPPLY CORPS

Donald D. Burbank
 William E. Nast

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Archer E. Church, Jr.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Milton T. VanMetre

NURSE CORPS

Elizabeth T. McDonald

The following named line officer for permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy with the grade of ensign and for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps, subject to qualification therefor provided by law:

Louis Huszar, Jr.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 15 (legislative day of July 2), 1954:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

James C. Worthy, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following to be commissioned for permanent appointment to the grade indicated, subject to qualifications provided by law:

To be captain

John C. Bose
 Samuel B. Grenell

To be lieutenant commanders

Allen L. Powell
 Norman E. Taylor

Theodore J. Lange
 Elbert D. Lighter
 Paul L. Millus
 Robert "A" Miller
 Charles H. Monroe, Jr.
 Larry E. Moore
 Ray B. Murphy
 Carroll E. Myers
 William S. Myers
 Robert F. McBain
 Harold A. McGrath
 Anthony Nesky, Jr.
 Thane N. Olson
 Shirley M. O'Neill
 Peter H. Orvis
 Trent R. Powers
 William B. Regan
 Donald D. Ritchey
 William R. Ritz
 Charles T. Roberts
 Robert "E" Roberts
 Donald D. Rzewnicki
 Eva W. Schekorra
 Bonnie J. Schuler
 Sheldon O. Schwartz
 Patrick J. Sciarretta
 Robert C. Sherar
 James G. Simcox
 Edmund A. Smith, Jr.
 Stanford A. Smith
 William F. Span
 Robert W. Spencer
 Dean Stockmeir
 Walter W. Stovall
 Leo A. Thibault
 Faris A. Tomlinson
 Billie C. Tyson
 Don L. Upton
 Dale R. Vandermolen
 Max W. Wakeland
 Carl B. Ward
 Allan P. Weintraub
 Robert E. Wickham
 Quentin E. Wilhelm
 Beverly R. Williford
 Raymond N. Winkel
 Bobbie D. Willard
 Gerald J. Witvoet

To be lieutenant

Omar H. Quade, Jr.

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Donald L. Campbell
 Albert J. Ramey

Robert M. Borst
 John F. Vance, Jr.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 15, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
 The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in the quietness of this moment of worship, may we become more keenly aware of the divine strength which surrounds us and the divine wisdom which Thou hast placed at our disposal.

We penitently acknowledge that we so frequently allow ourselves to become bewildered by things that do not matter, bewildered by problems of our own imagination, and worried by that which does not exist.

Pardon all our fickleness and foolishness, our doubt and distrust. May no willfulness of temper, no rebellion of mind, no perversity of spirit cloud our vision of Thyself, who art our life, our strength, our hope.

Grant that we may be inspired to do Thy will more perfectly, for in the doing of Thy will is our peace.

Show us today what kind of legislation will be most helpful as we seek to minister to the welfare and happiness of the poor, the sick, the aged, the lonely and discouraged, and the needy members of the human family.

Hear us in the name of our beloved Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 250. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the slip law for the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1276. An act to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act in order to increase the interest rate on loans made under title I of such act.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. J. Res. 534) entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built passenger-cargo vessels, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BUTLER, Mr. POTTER, and Mr. MAGNUSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9242) entitled "An act to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations and for the Alaska Communications System, and for other purposes."

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today a resolution is being brought to the floor from the Committee on Foreign Affairs which I am sure every Member of the House will be in accord with and for which we all will want to vote. Unfortunately it will be necessary for me to attend a luncheon at the White House today being given for the Prime Minister and other dignitaries from Libya. I appreciate this opportunity to express my complete agreement with the resolution and to say that I hope I shall be back when the roll is called. But, should I miss it, I want to register the fact that I am in accord with the resolution and would vote for it were I here.

MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY AT KINGS POINT, N. Y., SHOULD BE ON PERMANENT STATUS

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, pending before the Merchant Marine Committee at this time is H. R. 9434, introduced by my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. VAN PELT]. This bill should be passed at this session of Congress.

This bill would place the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., on a permanent status. Since the Academy's inception, it has had to come, hat in hand, before the Congress each year for funds in which to maintain itself. The time has come for the Congress to recognize the importance of the Academy and its graduates. Outside of the Naval Academy, Kings Point is the only source of trained naval personnel

wherein a 4-year course is devoted to the training of a man for life at sea. The Congress should act now. It should not duck this important issue. I would like to include an editorial from a Long Island daily newspaper, *Newsday*, emphasizing the gravity of the situation. Those trying to torpedo Kings Point have no conception of the harm they will do to national defense:

PATRONAGE VERSUS THE POINT

Once again the issue of State patronage is taking precedence over the national good in the Senate. Maine's two lawmakers, Senators PAYNE and SMITH, have asked the Senate to postpone action on giving Kings Point Merchant Marine Academy permanent status.

The Maine delegation fears that such status for Kings Point may mean the end of their State academy, which is subsidized by the Federal Government. The bill might also mean the end of State academies in Massachusetts, New York, and California, the four of which cost the United States \$787,000 a year.

The fears of the Maine Senators, we hope, are justified. There is no reason why the Government should support State academies when it has the facilities at Kings Point to do the job.

We see no point in holding up the bill. Though funds for the next year are already assured, morale is endangered by maintaining the Academy on what Representative BECKER called a crisis-to-crisis existence. As the Van Pelt subcommittee of the House has decided, and as Senator IRVING IVES asks, the school should be given permanent status and equality with the other service Academies.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Tuesday next, after the conclusion of the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on H. R. 9413, the Capitol Police Force bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

THE FIGHT FOR INDIAN HOSPITALS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, if you are a Member of Congress who is just as concerned about the health and well-being of America's native Indian population as you are about the natives of India, Pakistan, and the Far East—and I believe all United States Representatives have a greater concern about our own people—then I earnestly appeal to you to examine most carefully the conference report on H. R. 303 when it comes before this body.

In the very near future we should have before us the work of our conference committee on this bill, which has been presented as a simple transfer of responsibility for American Indian health—from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the United States Public Health Service. Some proponents of the measure have told the Indians that this bill is designed to provide better staffed and equipped hospitals for American Indians, and that it would not have the effect of closing any badly needed Indian hospitals in our country.

Those of us who oppose this bill are convinced that it is in reality a master plan for closing all Indian hospitals in this country, and for shifting all responsibility for Indian health to local and State shoulders. Such a purpose would be in violation of many statutory and treaty obligations of our Government in the field of American Indian health, and some advocates of H. R. 303 have denied any such purpose.

The simple fact is that Indian health conditions in our country require additional Indian hospitals, rather than their closing. When we consider that the tuberculosis rate among Oklahoma Indians is 7 times as high as among non-Indians, and the infant mortality rate is 10 times as high, it should be readily apparent that now is not the time to reduce our hospital effort.

H. R. 303 passed the House on the Consent Calendar, in the absence of some of its opponents from Washington, and through the belief of other opponents of the bill that open hearings on the Senate side would be helpful.

As a result of those open hearings—in which practically every Indian who testified gave testimony against the bill—the Senate added an amendment designed to reassure the Indian people and secure their cooperation in any substitute health program.

The Senate amendment provided that no hospital operated for a specific tribe of Indians could be closed without the consent of the tribal council. Since many tribes had invested heavily from tribal funds in these hospitals, and since they had become an integral part of Indian health programs in the States, this did not appear to be an unreasonable requirement. The Senate voted this amendment and returned the bill to the House.

But leading House conferees have announced their opposition to this amendment. One has been quoted as saying that such an amendment would make H. R. 303 unworkable.

If the real object of H. R. 303 is to provide better staffing and equipment for Indian hospitals, and a better health program, it is difficult to see how the protective amendment would harm the bill.

Of course, if the object of H. R. 303 is to close Indian hospitals, I will agree that the Senate amendment will make the bill unworkable.

There are many more reasons why our Indian hospitals should be kept in operation, and under the administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and when the conference report reaches us I hope to have the opportunity to discuss this

important question on the floor at greater length.

It could mean life or death for thousands of our first Americans.

I trust the House will give any further action on H. R. 303 its most careful consideration.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION INSURANCE LEGISLATION

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that the Senate in considering the Employment Security Administrative Act of 1954 on July 13 followed the example of the House in rejecting the principles of H. R. 9430 of which I have the honor to be a sponsor. H. R. 9430 was introduced in the House on June 3, 1954, and moves forward on the highest level of business statesmanship the accepted philosophy of the widely approved and entirely workable principle of Federal-State unemployment insurance.

Unemployment compensation insurance legislation is a problem of national policy that I believe to be of the first order of importance to the domestic economy of our country. It directly affects the Nation's business interests in a most sensitive area—the human area. And it reached to the very heart of the stability, the morale, and the character of the American worker. Yet, the legislation on the subject, H. R. 9709, as passed by the House on July 8, fails to achieve the elementary ends to which this type of legislation is directed. It falls short of dealing with the issue with the necessary boldness and completeness.

I submit respectfully that H. R. 9709 is weighed down by its own timidity. It is a cautious half-way attempt to do what needs to be done with a firm hand and a sure hold on the problem. This lack of forthrightness seems to me to be especially avoidable in face of the fact that we are dealing with a principle of Federal law and administration which has through the years demonstrated itself so successful that both H. R. 9430 and H. R. 9709, propose to extend the principle of Federal-State unemployment insurance. It happens that H. R. 9709 was introduced 25 days after the bill I favor. Of one thing I am certain: It is not the intent of this bill to suck the blood and eat the heart out of the unemployment insurance program. I am sure there is sincerity on the side of the opposition. And yet their set of fainthearted amendments in H. R. 9709, it seems to me, vitiates the whole unemployment insurance program, however good the intention. It is for this reason that I cannot help warning the proponents of H. R. 9709 that American labor has both the education and the experience, the tough and hard-earned knowledge that will enable it to see at a glance

that labor's interest, in time of crisis, is not genuinely nor adequately served by H. R. 9709. I commend the good intention but the technique is demonstrably faulty. Against this bill, which I hold to be a mere substitute in flimsy and superficial form for a needed sound measure, I commend the strength and the boldness of H. R. 9430.

Let us examine our problem more closely:

Both bills by their very appearance proclaim that the existing unemployment compensation insurance program has been rendered legislatively obsolete by two decades of change—since 1935. I will not dwell upon the depth and scope of this change except to point out that involved in it is the overwhelming impact of World War II. Thus the proponents of both bills are agreed upon the need for revision and advance. Under the basic or 1935 legislation an employer was required to have eight employees to come within the terms of the act. The States have, within the terms of the Federal law, individually legislated their own definitions of how many employees an employer is required to have in order to come within the meaning of the law. Under H. R. 9709 the employer must have four employees to come within the act. But under H. R. 9430, which I sponsored, it is sufficient that the employer have one or more employees to come within the coverage of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act. Again without condemning the motives of the opposition to the measure for which I stand, I submit that it is just as impractical, just as inherently unsound, to fail to cover the smallest employer of labor and his employee or employees, as the largest. How possibly can this insurance program do itself justice if it leaves out of its protection whole segments of the employer and employee population? Hunger, deprivation, and humiliation hits the employee out of work and his family just as hard if his employer employs only him or a thousand others as well.

If the bill of which I am cosponsor had no further advantage over the inadequate measure than this matter of 1 employee as against 4, this alone would be sufficient to commend it to our sense of fairness and to the overall aims for which all this legislation was enacted in the first place. For it represents the greatest enlightenment in the relations of Government, management, and the toiler since the Nation's evolution to its presently highly industrialized state from the agrarian economy of our early past.

The advocates of both bills seek to have the Government employees included under the benefits of unemployment insurance. But while the advocates of H. R. 9709 include the Government workers in their legislation, my fellow sponsors and I recognizing the complexities of the situation, planned separate legislation for the Government worker. Surely this intelligent separation, tailoring each of two measures to meet specific differences, must win the approval of those who wish to avoid confusion and who look for the highest degree of sim-

licity and efficiency in the programs enacted by the Congress.

The bill I urged is a scientifically devised measure that has the fullest and the wisest grasp of the technicalities of the problem. It has made itself cognizant of the human weaknesses that, in less thoughtfully designed measures, would lead to a maudlin kind of dogoodism. Thus, for example, it would permit a State to disqualify an individual who has left suitable work or refused to accept suitable work without good cause or who is discharged for misconduct in connection with his work. It would permit a State to disqualify an individual in the case of strikes if he is a participant or has a direct interest in the strike for any week in which his unemployment is due to the strike. Disqualification may be extended to 12 weeks in the event of fraud or willful misrepresentation.

This statesmanlike H. R. 9430 legislation takes into consideration standard of living variations in the several States. It provides that the maximum benefit under the State law be not less than an amount equal to two-thirds of the average weekly wage within that State. And then it requires that the individual subject to this maximum receive unemployment insurance compensation equal to at least one-half of his average weekly wage. And those who are eligible are to receive at least 39 weeks of unemployment benefits a year.

The States under the bill I endorsed have an increased latitude in the matter of determining the methods of reducing employers' taxes under the State law below 2.7 percent. That bill protects the unemployment fund, requiring that all collections under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act in the Federal unemployment account be earmarked to the unemployment trust fund. A State whose accumulated funds for unemployment compensation get precariously low may receive a reinsurance grant from the Federal unemployment account under the bill I hope becomes law. It also imposes a minimum rate of contribution of at least 1.2 percent whenever a State's fund drops below 6 percent.

There are many other improvements in detail and in technique in the bill which I hoped the House would adopt. It stands head and shoulders over the bill passed by the House from whatever avenue of approach you propose to consider the two measures. It is not a radical change in the principle of unemployment insurance, but it is a distinct advance consonant with the change and expansion of the American economy. H. R. 9430 would meet the problem head-on and would solve it, I believe conservatively and soundly for the good of business, for the good of the employee, and eminently for the strengthening and the health of the American people and their economy.

INCREASE IN VETERANS' SERVICE-CONNECTED COMPENSATION

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the Radwan discharge petition was placed on the desk yesterday. I am happy to announce that I have signed this petition, designed to bring up H. R. 9020, a bill which provides a 10-percent increase in pensions for service-connected veterans, and smaller increases for non-service-connected cases. I urge my colleagues to put their names to this petition, so that we may act on this moderate legislation.

This House has recognized the need to increase pensions for other persons—social-security beneficiaries, among others. It is just as difficult for a disabled veteran to meet the rising cost of living on a fixed pension as it is for any other citizen, so we are obligated to adjust the compensation of our veterans.

According to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the American Legion, Department of Illinois, we have in our State alone some 115,000 disabled veterans who are now drawing compensation or pension, and some 40,000 cases to which the Veterans' Administration is paying entirely inadequate benefits to widows, children, and dependent parents.

H. R. 9020 was reported by the Committee on Veterans Affairs after extensive hearings. It has been well established that veterans should be given moderate cost-of-living increases in compensation. The committee, in its unanimous action, also cut the cost of the increase by \$58 million in an effort to meet the administration's desire for economy. I believe the committee should be complimented in its effort to provide the veterans with a needed increase, to enable the administration to carry out its pledges, and at the same time to put a minimum burden on the budget.

SENATOR DAVID I. WALSH MEMORIAL

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record my remarks in part at the recent dedicatory exercises of the Senator David I. Walsh memorial statue at the Esplanade, Boston, Mass., on June 6, 1954.

The occasion was most impressive. It was attended by members of the clergy, Senator SALTONSTALL, Governor Herter, Members of Congress, and the general court, and other prominent public officials, Judge Connelly and other distinguished members of the judiciary, as well as a large group of distinguished guests, relatives, and friends of one of Massachusetts' greatest sons in the public service.

The invocation was given by the Very Reverend Oscar R. O'Gorman, pastor of St. Agnes Church, Arlington, Mass. The

unveiling was conducted by Senator Walsh's dear and loyal friend of almost 40 years, a native of the Philippines, and a member of his immediate household, Isidro Carino.

The memorial, which was authorized by the Massachusetts General Court, upon the petition of Judge Connelly, representing close friends of Senator Walsh and members of the Walsh Memorial Association, was presented in behalf of the Commonwealth by the distinguished commissioner of the metropolitan district commission, the Honorable Charles W. Greenough. It was accepted for the Commonwealth by His Excellency, Gov. Christian A. Herter. Senator SALTONSTALL delivered an eloquent dedicatory address.

The United States Navy Band of the First Naval District was in attendance and rendered touching musical selections. Because of Senator Walsh's great and magnificent contributions to the Navy, as chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, it was most fitting that the Navy should be represented at the exercises.

My remarks as presiding chairman of the occasion follow in part:

My friends, we proudly and gratefully gather here today to unveil and dedicate this beautiful statue of our beloved friend and benefactor, Senator Walsh.

This magnificent sculpture has been wrought by the hand of a talented and distinguished artist.

For years to come, it will stand here on this lovely spot, within the great historic city of Boston, where American liberty was fostered.

Generations of Americans yet unborn will pass by this spot and observe this impressive memorial, which the vision and loyalty of friends like Judge Connelly, the distinguished leader of the Walsh Memorial Association, and the generosity and consideration of our great general court, have made possible.

His noble countenance lifted to the heavens, just as it was during his long, fruitful life of illustrious service to the cause of the common people, beaming constant inspiration and hope to all those who love and cherish the cause of human liberty, freedom, and democracy, to which our great, honored, and lamented friend, Senator Walsh, so completely and courageously devoted his life.

For his was a career of devoted service to the people and to the Nation he loved so well. His was a lifetime of loyalty and sacrifice to preserve our liberties, to promote social justice, and to keep this Nation strong and impregnable against foreign enemies and the insidious ravages of domestic subversion.

In the ranks of great American patriots and statesmen, the name of David I. Walsh is indelibly emblazoned upon the history of the era in which he lived. His rugged integrity, his indomitable courage, his great eloquence, his unswerving loyalty to God and to country, his unsurpassed vision in charting a safe course for our beloved country, his unyielding allegiance to the cause of the common people from whom he sprang, all these marked him with the unforgettable insignia of greatness.

His mortal self has departed from our midst, from the company of those of us who loved him for the warmth and nobility of his friendship, and for his endearing personal qualities, as well as from the people who found in his stalwart, inspiring leadership superlative example of Americanism. But his memory is forever enshrined in our hearts. The memory of his devout life, his

exalted principles, his noble deeds, his sympathetic understanding, his vivid patriotism, his profound devotion to God, to country, and to every righteous cause, will live imperishably to inspire hope in the struggling and the oppressed, and to keep the fires of patriotism burning in the hearts and minds of our people. David I. Walsh—great soul, great statesman, great American—we hail your hallowed memory today. In this great crisis, may Almighty God give us the high purpose, the strength, and the wisdom to cling tenaciously to your lofty ideals, your loyalty, and your love of our native land.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

RESOLUTION OF GREETING TO PEOPLES AND LEGISLATIVE BODIES OF THE GOLD COAST AND NIGERIA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution extending on behalf of the House of Representatives the most cordial greetings to the legislative bodies of the Gold Coast and Nigeria on the occasion of the first meeting of their legislatures, and in addition authorizing the Secretary of State to appoint a United States delegation at the appropriate time to represent the United States at ceremonies marking the achievement of complete self-government for these territories.

On April 29, 1954, a new constitution was approved for the Gold Coast which brings it to the threshold of sovereign independence. Under it an all-African Government with almost complete responsibility for the country's internal affairs has been established. After an election with universal adult suffrage, Kwame Nkrumah has been chosen Prime Minister. Nkrumah, educated at Lincoln University in Pennsylvania, was the first African ever to hold such office in any British territory. His leadership is, indeed, a great source of hope for the 4 million people of the Gold Coast.

Similarly in Nigeria, the largest of the United Kingdom territories with a population of 31.5 million, a new federal constitution representing the will of the people as expressed through their leaders is expected to be approved next month. The new constitution will give the 3 regions of Nigeria greater autonomy and will carry 2 of the 3 regions a considerable way toward self-government. Supplementing these moves toward independence, the United Kingdom has declared that in 1956 they will be prepared to grant full self-gov-

ernment to any region that may wish it in respect to those subjects that are a regional responsibility. Nnamdi Azikwe, who recently visited the United States, will become Prime Minister of the eastern region. Like his Gold Coast counterpart, he, too, is an alumnus of Lincoln University and a respected leader of nationalist movements throughout western Africa.

Our Nation's policy encourages legitimate efforts toward independence and self-government among those peoples who demonstrate a desire and capacity to establish and protect free institutions. This must be the strength of our position in former colonial and underdeveloped areas. Accordingly, Congress should take official cognizance of the momentous events that are now happening in western Africa. At a time when man's natural will to be free is thwarted in many parts of the world by the subversion practiced by Communists under the leadership of the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communist regime, the significance of recent developments in the Gold Coast and Nigeria looms very large for the free world's success. We should be sure not to repeat the mistakes in Africa which are costing the free world so dearly in southeast Asia.

Since the British acquisition of the territories now comprising the Gold Coast and Nigeria during the 19th century, vast changes have been wrought there. From primitive tribal cultures these territories have now advanced to a degree of social and political maturity that should soon allow them to assume their rightful places among the free nations of the world. We must make it unmistakably clear that it is our purpose to aid the practical efforts of these people to achieve independence and self-government. I therefore urge that Congress extend its most cordial greetings to the first meetings of the Gold Coast and Nigerian Legislatures which are expected to be held in July and September respectively and that the Secretary of State appoint a delegation at the appropriate time to represent the United States at ceremonies marking the achievement of complete independence for these territories. Such acts would be fitting recognition of the democratic ideals shared by the United States and these countries and would be a reaffirmation of the friendship of the United States for the peoples of Africa.

MILITARY AND NAVAL CONSTRUCTION ACT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9242) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations and for the Alaska communications system, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2237)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9242) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations and for the Alaska Communications System, and for other purposes, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 14, 20, 24, 25, and 28.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, and 64, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "Provided, That the Secretary of the Army, in exercising the authority granted herein, shall, whenever practicable and in the best interests of the United States, provide for the rehabilitation of existing barracks and officer quarters in lieu of new construction"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "\$2,787,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "\$10,994,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In the matter proposed to be inserted by amendment strike out "\$1,007,963,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,034,906,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "\$129,096,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "\$236,060,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "\$102,042,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the follow-

ing: "\$201,893,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 510. All contracts entered into by the United States pursuant to the authorization contained in this Act shall be awarded, so far as practicable, if the interest of the national security shall not be impaired thereby and if such award is consistent with the provisions of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder."

And the Senate agree to the same.

LES ARENDS,
PAUL W. SHAFER,
LEROY JOHNSON,
JAMES VAN ZANDT,
CARL VINSON,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
L. MENDEL RIVERS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
FRANCIS CASE,
JAS. H. DUFF,
HARRY F. BYRD,
By J. C. S.

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9242) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

LEGISLATION IN CONFERENCE

On May 26, 1954 the House of Representatives passed H. R. 9242 which was the fiscal year 1955 military construction authorization for the three military departments and the Alaska Communication System. On July 9, 1954 the Senate considered the House bill and amended it in several respects.

The major differences and the action agreed upon by the conferees are as follows:

The amendment requiring that the authorizations for construction provided for in Title I would be administered in accordance with a building program that would expend for rehabilitation at least \$5,000,000 of the total \$45,000,000 authorized for barracks and bachelor officer quarters in lieu of that amount for new construction, was modified so as to permit a discretionary approach by the Secretary of the Army in such fashion as to utilize the rehabilitation authority where such would be in the best interests of the United States. The Senate amendment with respect to Fort Belvoir was modified by the addition of one barracks over those allowed by the Senate at this installation. The Senate receded with respect to Fort Bliss to the extent that five additional barracks were authorized and all of the bachelor officer quarters re-inserted. The Senate receded entirely with respect to the troop housing and other facilities at Fort Hood, Tex.

In the Navy portion, the Senate receded with respect to the four barracks which had been deferred at the Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station at Beaufort, S. C. The Senate further receded with respect to the reinsertion of the land item at the Naval Magazine, Fort Chicago, Calif. The pipeline at Elk Hills, Calif., which had been stricken by the House and reinserted by the Senate was again stricken by the conferees and the Sen-

ate further receded with respect to its reinsertion of the facilities at the Navy Ammunition Depot, Fallbrook, Calif.

The Air Force section remained unchanged with the exception of a remedial amendment to section 302 (b) which was added by the Senate for the purpose of rescinding an unused authorization that would otherwise have remained in that section.

The new section 510, which would have required that all contracts entered into by the United States, pursuant to the authorization contained in H. R. 9242, should be awarded, so far as practicable, and where the interest of the national security would not be impaired, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder. This new section was modified by the addition of a provision that this limitation would obtain only so far as such would not be in conflict with the Armed Services Procurement Act.

Otherwise the House receded with respect to the Senate amendments.

LES C. ARENDS,
PAUL W. SHAFER,
LEROY JOHNSON,
JAMES VAN ZANDT,
CARL VINSON,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
L. MENDEL RIVERS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUSTRALIAN WAR MEMORIAL

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 9006) to amend the act of May 22, 1896, as amended, concerning the loan or gift of works of art and other material, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That (a) the Secretary of the Army is authorized to transfer to the Australian War Memorial in Canberra, Australia, without compensation, 28 German war paintings depicting Australian troops which are now the property of the United States in the custody of the Secretary of the Army.

"(b) Nothing contained in this act shall authorize the expenditure of any funds of the United States to defray any cost of transportation or handling incident to such transfer."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to donate 28 paintings to the Australian War Memorial."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSING BILL

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on H. R. 7839, the so-called housing bill, may have until midnight Sunday to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

HARDING LAKE CAMP, FAIRBANKS, ALASKA

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2900) to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Harding Lake Camp, Inc., of Fairbanks, Alaska, for use as a youth camp and related purposes, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SAYLOR, D'EWART, DAWSON of Utah, ENGLE, and ASPINALL.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SEATING OF COMMUNIST REGIME IN CHINA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 634) providing for the consideration of House Resolution 627, a resolution reiterating the opposition of the House of Representatives to the seating of the Communist regime in China in the United Nations, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Resolution 627, reiterating the opposition of the House of Representatives to the seating of the Communist regime in China in the United Nations. After general debate, which shall be confined to the resolution and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommitt.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], and I now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of House Resolution 627.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the Member who made the point of order of no quorum is not present on the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not state a point of order.

One hundred and forty Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 104]

Barden	Heller	Perkins
Barrett	Hillings	Powell
Bonin	Hollifield	Regan
Brooks, La.	Horan	Rivers
Buckley	Keating	Roosevelt
Camp	Kersten, Wis.	Scott
Cotton	Long	Shafer
Coudert	Lucas	Shelley
Curtis, Mo.	Lyle	Short
Curtis, Nebr.	McGregor	Sikes
Dingell	Mailliard	Sutton
Dodd	Martin, Iowa	Thompson, La.
Durham	Miller, Calif.	Thompson, Tex.
Fallon	Miller, Kans.	Utt
Feighan	Morrison	Weichel
Fisher	Norblad	Wheeler
Fogarty	O'Brien, Mich.	Willis
Harris	Ostertag	
Harrison, Wyo.	Patman, Tex.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 373 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

HUCKSTERISM

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is tentatively scheduled to adjourn at the end of this month, and there is no doubt that it can do so if the leadership is determined to push through on that timetable. But whether it can do so and still enact into law sizable portions of the legislative program remains to be seen. Many of the top issues are still tied up in Senate committees or in conference committees composed of representatives of both Houses.

As usual, the House is far ahead of the Senate in the passage of important bills. With its privilege of unlimited debate, the Senate can spend days and even weeks on an issue that the House might pass inside of 3 or 4 hours. And when the Senate does complete action on a bill, it frequently does not look anything like the bill the House passed, because any Senator can submit unlimited amendments to it while we in the House are sometimes restricted under our rules from even trying to amend a bill.

Then it is up to conference committees to iron out the differences and agree on a final version of the measure. If the disagreements are deep-seated enough—as they frequently are—the conferees may argue for weeks, and then come

through with a compromise bill at the very last minute.

So we face an adjournment rush of conference bills in the next few weeks which will be almost overwhelming. Issues which were fought out once in House debate will come up all over again in perhaps different form, and the Congress—as always—will resemble nothing so much as chaos in the dying days of the session.

Among big issues still hanging and still unresolved are: Housing, foreign aid, the agriculture bill, tax revision, unemployment compensation, the issue of raising the ceiling on the national debt from the present maximum of \$275 billion, postal pay, social security, and a controversial atomic energy control bill.

HUCKSTERISM

The word "hucksterism"—overselling some product by extravagant and misleading claims—was coined to describe the excesses of some of the big high-powered advertising agencies. In the past year and a half, it has sometimes been applied to statements put out by the Eisenhower administration, which has a lot of top advertising men in its councils. You might be interested in a recent example of this hucksterism which I came across in reading a new Labor Department publication.

In urging the extension of unemployment compensation to government employees who lose their jobs, Under Secretary of Labor Arthur Larson, formerly of the faculty of the University of Pittsburgh, recently gave the House Ways and Means Committee a graphic picture of the experience of recently laid-off Labor Department employees. He said that 3 to 4 months after losing their jobs:

Three out of ten were still out of work; more than 3 out of 10 had been jobless for 3 months or more; and 4 out of 10 for 1 to 3 months; most of those finding new jobs had to take a pay cut—a third took a cut of more than \$1,000 a year; close to one-half of the reemployed took temporary jobs; women found it more difficult than men, and those 45 years and over found it more difficult than younger employees to locate new jobs; and accrued annual leave was adequate to cover the duration of unemployment of only a third of the separated Federal workers.

That is the way the Under Secretary described the situation to Congress. But a few weeks later, when the Labor Department's monthly magazine came out with a report on the same issue, this is the way it had been huckstered up by one of the administration publicists:

Nearly two-thirds of the employees involuntarily separated . . . found jobs within 3 months. Salaries for well over two-fifths of those who found new positions were higher than or at least as high as (their Labor Department pay) . . . and more than half of the reemployed regarded their new positions as permanent.

In other words, instead of putting the grim facts in their true perspective as the Undersecretary had done, the administration had to pretty up the disturbing figures to make them look good. A typical example of hucksterism.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Sunday night to file reports on S. 3589, the Export-Import Bank bill; and, if reported out, as we hope it may be, the bill H. R. 9756, to increase the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight tonight to file reports on H. R. 9666 and H. R. 8932.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SEATING OF COMMUNIST REGIME IN CHINA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 634, which will make in order the consideration of the House Resolution 627, reiterating the opposition of the House of Representatives to the seating of the Communist regime in China in the United Nations.

House Resolution 634 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on House Resolution 627 itself.

The resolution which has been reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs is a simple one and one that is entirely consistent with the past action of the Congress of the United States on this point.

Specifically House Resolution 627 states that the House of Representatives reiterates its opposition to the seating of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the United Nations or any of its specialized agencies and supports the President in his expressed determination to use all means to prevent such representation.

According to the report on this resolution the fact that Congress will shortly adjourn and that the General Assembly of the United Nations is scheduled to meet in September of 1954 made it desirable that Congress again give voice to its opinion on the subject.

As far as I can see there can be no opposition to the resolution itself. The Congress of the United States by passing this resolution will again go on record before the world as definitely opposed to the admission of Communist China to the United Nations and it seems to me that just the plain defining of our position once more will serve to bolster our case and our cause on this subject with our allies throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I call for the adoption of the rule which will make possible the consideration of House Resolution 627.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time. I think we are all against sin; and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 627) reiterating the opposition of the House of Representatives to the seating of the Communist regime in China in the United Nations.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Resolution 627, with Mr. ELLSWORTH in the chair.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives reiterates its opposition to the seating of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the United Nations or any of its specialized agencies and supports the President in his expressed determination to use all means to prevent such representation.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I think the reasons why this resolution has been brought out unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Affairs at this time are well known to everybody.

The House of Representatives took action along the same lines on January 19, 1951, after the Chinese Communists had intervened in the aggression against South Korea and were beginning the push for admission to the United Nations. The House took similar action in May, 1951, and again in July, 1953. But developments in the world today, the renewed aggression of the Communists in the Far East and the apparent disposition of some of the nations that are our allies around the world to reconsider their previous opposition, in view of the increased strength of the Communists, made our committee feel that it is important that nobody in the world have any misunderstanding as to the feeling of the Congress, representing the people of the United States, on this issue. So it was unanimously voted to bring a resolution reiterating our position before the Congress. There were several resolutions on the subject before the committee—the first one introduced more than a year ago by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] and others recently by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLARDY] and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER]. Hearings were held on the resolutions last week by the subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific, of which I am the chairman. The original Bentley resolution was amended to take cognizance of the pres-

ent situation, reintroduced by him as House Resolution 627 and voted out unanimously by the full committee. At this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, House Resolution 627, as reported unanimously 2 days ago by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, states that the House of Representatives reiterates its opposition to the seating of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the United Nations or any of its specialized agencies and supports the President in his expressed determination to use all means to prevent such representation.

Over a year ago I introduced House Joint Resolution 286, which would automatically provide for a reexamination of our policy toward the United Nations if the Red Chinese should be seated therein. The Department of State felt, however, that, while such a reexamination would be axiomatic in this event, it should not be assumed that the admission of Red China was to be expected.

I have recently reviewed all courses of action available to us for the purpose of preventing the seating of Communist China with high officials of the administration. While I do not believe that we should expose all possible tactics at this time, I do think that they are sufficient to keep Communist China out of the United Nations as long as the administration is resolved upon the firm stand in that respect which it has already announced. As proof of this firm stand, I will ask unanimous consent in the House to insert among my remarks at this point excerpts from the texts of the press conferences of President Eisenhower on July 7 and Secretary Dulles on July 8 as reported in the July 16 issue of U. S. News & World Report.

HOW IKE FEELS ABOUT RED CHINA

Here's what the President said about Red China at his press conference on July 7, 1954. The following answers by Mr. Eisenhower were released for direct quotation:

Question: "I wonder if you could give us today, sir, your own feelings on the admission of the present Communist Government of China to the United Nations."

The President: "I would be glad to. As you know, and I have said before this particular group, I am completely and unalterably opposed, under the present situation, to the admission of Red China into the United Nations. I personally think that 95 percent of the population of the United States would take the same stand."

"Now, let's take a look at this thing for a minute, if you will bear with me:

"There is a moral question, first of all, that is involved. The United Nations was not established primarily as a supergovernment, clothed with all of the authority of supergovernment and of great power to do things."

"It was, among other things, an attempt to marshal the moral strength of the world in order to preserve peace, to make certain that quarrels were composed through a decent respect for justice and fairness and right, and to see whether we couldn't avoid resort to force."

"Now, today we have Red China going to Geneva, and instead of taking a conciliatory attitude toward anything, it excoriated the United Nations."

"As a matter of fact, in Geneva, it demanded repudiation of the United Nations position. On top of that, Red China is today

at war with the United Nations. They were declared an aggressor by the United Nations, in the Assembly. That situation has never been changed.

"They are occupying North Korea; they have supported this great effort at further enslavement of the peoples in Indochina; they have held certain of our prisoners unjustifiably, and they have been guilty of the employment of the worst possible diplomatic deportment in the international affairs of the world.

"Now, how can the United States, as a self-respecting nation, doing its best and in conformity with the moral standards as we understand them, how can we possibly say this Government should be admitted to the United Nations?

"That is the way the case stands now, and that is my position."

Question: "Mr. President, to carry that a little bit further, sir, there have been some suggestions on the Hill [Capitol Hill] that if Red China is admitted over our protest, that the United States should then withdraw from the U. N. Would you comment on that, sir?"

The President: "Well, yes, I would."

"We went into the United Nations under treaty forms. Now, I must say, first, if the United States ever reaches the point that it wants to repudiate solemn treaty obligations, it must do so after the most careful deliberation and study of all of the consequences that could be involved.

"Secondly, I repeat, the establishment of the United Nations was an effort to rally the moral forces of the world. I don't see how, in all conscience, the United Nations—I don't see how any state, impartial state, can vote for their acceptance under present conditions—I just don't understand it.

"But if they should, if these people, mistakenly, as we believe, could override us—and I don't know that they can—I would fight to the last minute to prove they can't. But if they should, the question of whether we would accomplish more good in the world, whether we could advance the cause of peace and decency better by going out than by staying in, that is something that would have to be decided.

"My own feeling is this: I never give up a battle until I am licked completely, utterly, and destroyed, and I don't believe in giving up any battle as long as I have got a chance to win."

In what follows, the President's answers are paraphrased, in accordance with White House custom:

Question: "Sir, is it a fair inference from your remarks, then, that you oppose any amendment to the foreign-aid bill, or any current legislation, which would automatically take us out if Red China is admitted?"

The President: Mr. Eisenhower said he didn't believe an amendment was up officially, but he did not think cases should be prejudged. He believes such problems should be taken as they arise, and he doubts that any such amendment will be seriously considered.

Question: "Sir, could you tell us if what you have told us here is approximately what you told Senator KNOWLAND yesterday? [WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican, of California, had stated earlier that, if Red China were admitted to the United Nations, he would resign his Senate majority leadership and work to end United States membership in the U. N.]

The President: Mr. Eisenhower said that he and Senator KNOWLAND had conversed about many things and were, he thought, in conformity on most of their ideas.

On this one, the President added, Senator KNOWLAND had said he himself would begin the fight for withdrawing the United States from the United Nations.

The President had not reached any such decision, he said.

Question: "Mr. President, can you think of any circumstances under which you would favor admission of Red China into the U. N.?"

The President: Mr. Eisenhower said Red China would have to show a record of deeds that would prove really good faith and a readiness and a capacity on Red China's part to discharge its obligations in the international field properly and decently.

MR. DULLES: RED CHINA IS "DISQUALIFIED" FOR U. N. SEAT

Following in full text are Secretary Dulles' answers to questions dealing with Red China's admission to the United Nations, from his press conference of July 8, 1954. The questions and replies are as released by the State Department:

At his news conference today, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles was asked whether he favored United States withdrawal from the United Nations if Red China is admitted to that organization. Secretary Dulles made the following reply:

"I am so confident that the Communist regime will not be seated in any of the principal organs of the United Nations that I do not care to proceed on the assumption that they will be seated. I think that weakens our case and strikes a note of defeatism which I think is entirely unjustified.

"The United States has a powerful case in this respect and it is a viewpoint which is shared by many other members of the United Nations. The record of the Chinese Communist regime is such that it is, in my opinion, clearly not qualified to be seated in the United Nations.

"Let me, if I may, elaborate that a bit. I recall from the days at San Francisco in 1945, when the charter was drawn, that there was at that time a very considerable argument on whether the United Nations should be a universal body which would represent all the governments of the world, good, bad, or indifferent, or whether membership should be on a selective basis. That was strongly argued at San Francisco and the proponents of selectivity won. That is reflected by the provision in the charter that members should be peace-loving and able and willing to discharge their obligations under the Charter. That is strengthened furthermore by the provision that any nation against which enforcement action was taken should be liable to suspension from membership in the United Nations. In other words, the United Nations was not set up to be a reformatory. It was assumed that you would be good before you got in and not that being in would make you good.

"The United States, basing itself on the principles of the charter, which are clear, takes the position that the Communist regime is disqualified by its consistent record of opposition to the principles of the United Nations. In Korea it carried on war against the United Nations. At the Geneva Conference it continuously denounced the United Nations. It has been the subject of enforcement action recommended by the United Nations. In southeast Asia it promoted aggression. All of these facts combine to make a case such that we do not believe that the requisite vote can be found to admit the Communist regime to represent China in the United Nations. Because we believe that, we do not think that it is wise to proceed on the assumption that we are going to be defeated. I do not believe Communist China in fact is going to be seated.

"So far there are over 150 test cases which have come up in one or the other of the organs of the United Nations and in every one of those cases the position has been taken that the Communist regime should not be seated. In view of the strength of our case, the fact that we know many other countries

share it with us, and in view of the past record, I see no reason whatever to assume that we are going to be defeated on this issue at the present time."

Mr. Dulles was asked what he considered the requisite vote to defeat Red China's being seated to be. He replied:

"I believe that as far as the General Assembly is concerned this certainly is an important matter which would require a two-thirds vote. Anybody that says this is not an important matter is certainly not facing up to the realities of the situation. I believe that in the Security Council it is a matter which is properly subject to veto."

Mr. Dulles was asked whether that meant that the United States would use the veto if necessary. He replied:

"It means that we would invoke the veto if necessary, yes."

Mr. Dulles was asked whether that meant that the United States does not consider it a question of credentials. He replied:

"It means that we consider it what the charter calls an important matter. The charter says that important matters shall require a two-thirds vote, and, as I say, anybody that does not think this is an important matter is exercising a curious judgment."

The Secretary was asked whether, in the event that there would have to be a veto to determine whether this was or was not an important matter that would be by majority vote. He replied:

"That would be by a majority vote. The charter contains, in relation to the General Assembly, the basic provision that important matters shall require a two-thirds vote. It then goes on by way of illustration to indicate certain matters which are by definition important matters. Then it goes on to say that the creation of an additional category of important matters should be by a majority vote."

Mr. Dulles was asked who would be hurt the most by American withdrawal from the U. N. He replied:

"I don't think there is going to be any American withdrawal from the U. N. or any occasion for it."

A correspondent raised the point that Mr. Dulles' predecessor (Dean Acheson) took the position that a vote on Chinese Communist membership in the Security Council was not a vetoable question. Mr. Dulles was asked why his thinking differed on this point. The Secretary replied:

"The view is clearly accepted that the admission of a new member is subject to veto. And then the question arises as to whether the admission of a new government is subject to veto.

"In view of the fact that the charter tests as to eligibility obviously relate to governments, or can only be applied in terms of governments, it seems to me that if you look at the substance of the matter rather than the form, the question of the eligibility of a new government should be subject to the same voting tests as the admission of a new state.

"The charter says that a state shall not be eligible for membership unless it is able and willing to carry out its obligations under the charter. Now, the question as to whether a state is able and willing to carry out its obligations under the charter clearly depends upon its government. There is no way in the world of determining ability and willingness to carry out obligations except in terms of what is the attitude of the government, just as in the case of Guatemala, which has been referred to. In that case we are withholding recognition until we are satisfied that the government will be able and willing to carry out its international obligations.

"The test that the charter applies is a test which can only be applied in terms of

governments. You cannot apply the test to an amorphous body, such as a state, without regard to its government. Therefore, as far as the substance of the matter is concerned, it seems to us that it is a substantive and not a procedural matter to determine whether or not the Communist regime shall be seated. That is the reality of the situation.

"The Soviet Union by veto prevents the admission of Japan, of Italy, and of many states who are qualified because of their peace-loving and law-abiding governments to membership. To say that the Soviet Union can exercise that right in that respect, but that in this respect the right cannot be exercised, seems to me to put the letter above the spirit of the charter."

Mr. Dulles was asked how he accounted for the fact that some of the governments whose representatives at Geneva only a few weeks ago signed the 16-power declaration, which, in effect, terminated the Korean talks, can now so materially alter the view that they expressed in that declaration. He replied:

"Well, I was reading that just before I came down here. It says: 'The Communists repudiated and rejected the authority and competence of the United Nations in Korea and have labeled the United Nations itself as a tool of aggression. Were we to accept this position of the Communists, it would mean the death of the principle of collective security and of the United Nations itself.'

"Sixteen nations signed that declaration, and one of the reasons why I am confident that the Communist Chinese regime will not be seated in the United Nations is because of the fact that the principle to which they subscribed at that time leads irrefutably to the conclusion that that regime should not be brought into the United Nations. As, indeed, is said there, the position which Communist China represents, if it were accepted, would mean the death of the principle of collective security and of the United Nations itself."

Mr. Dulles was asked whether his views on the admission of Communist China to the U. N. have been modified since writing his book, *War or Peace*, in 1950, since, the reporter said, the book stated that the only test should be whether they govern the country or not, and it argued in favor of the universal theme rather than the selectivity theme. The Secretary replied:

"In the first place, I was arguing for an amendment of the Charter of the United Nations which would adopt the principle of universality. The other theory was adopted and is in the charter, and that is what we are bound by at the present time. Furthermore, since that was written, there has been the aggression of the North Koreans in Korea. There has been the condemnation of Communist China as an aggressor. There has been the support by Communist China of aggression in Indochina.

"These are all events which in the winter of 1949 to 1950 were not predictable. We were entitled to believe at that time that there was a general acceptance of the principles of the United Nations. Since that time there has been a very marked change in the situation. There has been a series of actions which indicate that the hopes which were legitimately entertained, I think at that time perhaps cannot be entertained with the same confidence at the present time."

The Secretary was asked whether that is not also true of the Soviet Union. What distinctions, he was asked, do you draw between your argument on the selectivity of the Soviet Union and Red China? Mr. Dulles replied:

"The Soviet Union is at the present time seated in the United Nations. It cannot be put out of the United Nations because it would be able to veto that action. In the case of the Soviet Union the matter is academic even if we assume, which is not neces-

sarily to be assumed, that the record of the Soviet Union is comparable to that of Communist China. The Soviet Union has never been declared an aggressor by the United Nations nor have enforcement measures been taken against it such as would justify suspension under the United Nations Charter."

Mr. Dulles was asked whether the position of Communist China in relation to the principles of the U. N. is a worse record than that of the Soviet Union. He replied:

"Yes, because Communist China has been found by the United Nations to be an aggressor, and the United Nations has called for enforcement measures against Communist China. There is nothing comparable in that respect, as far as the record of the Soviet Union is concerned. Whether that should be the case or not is another question. But the fact is that the Soviet Union has not been found by the United Nations to be an aggressor. Therefore it is not a question of inviting into the United Nations a government which is itself at war with the United Nations and is today subject to sanctions which have been called for by the United Nations."

The Secretary was asked whether we are prepared to have this issue come to a vote in September when the next Assembly meets, or whether we would seek to postpone a vote on the Chinese admission. Mr. Dulles replied:

"I would not want to predict at this time what the particular techniques will be. Last year the matter came up in the form of a resolution, which I think I moved, that the question of the admission of Communist China be postponed for the period of the Eighth Assembly. That resolution prevailed. I remember I handled it myself personally on the floor at the opening day of the General Assembly."

He was asked whether or not he was ruling out the possibility that that move might be made again. Mr. Dulles replied:

"No; that might very well be the procedure that would be followed."

He was asked whether in such a case the vote required would be two-thirds or a majority. Mr. Dulles replied:

"My recollection is that the resolution was adopted by a two-thirds vote so that it became academic."

There have been various expressions here and in the other body which would favor an announced declaration by the Congress as to what our course of action should be in case of Red Chinese seating. I feel it would be unwise to thus commit ourselves in advance. There is no question but that, should the administration be unsuccessful in its opposition which does not appear likely, our entire policy toward the United Nations would undergo a most thorough review by both the administration and the Congress. I am in sympathy with many of the proposed further courses of action that have been expressed, but I would not like to see us committed to any of them at this time.

Mr. Chairman, the overwhelming desire of the Congress at this point should be to lend all possible support to the administration in its efforts to keep Red China out of the United Nations. I can think of no better way to express this support than the meaning of House Resolution 627 which I hope will pass the House by unanimous rollcall.

The Charter of the United Nations was intended to make that organization the focal point for the mobilization of moral force throughout the world. If Red China were admitted to the United Nations that moral force would not only be weakened but would be thoroughly dis-

sipated and torn asunder. It is not a question of whether Red China is legally entitled to a seat, it is a question of whether that regime is morally entitled. Certainly, as long as the United Nations has declared the Chinese Communists to be an aggressor group, there should be no talk or thought of their seating. That is why I say that if the Red Chinese were to be admitted in view of all the circumstances, the question of our future membership in the United Nations or our financial support of that organization would be academic. If such an event came to pass, it would hardly be necessary for this Government to walk out of the United Nations because that organization would be so discredited that it would fall apart through a dissolution of the moral strength which now binds its members together.

Mr. Chairman, it is with conviction as to the obligation of the Congress to express itself in this sense prior to adjournment and before the September meeting of the General Assembly that I offered House Resolution 627. I feel that our members would be derelict in their duty if they did not again place themselves on record in this respect, both for the sake of the people whose representatives we are and also as a warning to the other member nations of the United Nations throughout the world. Given the unequivocal promises of the President and the Secretary to do all in their power to continue to bar Red China, our proper function at this moment is to pledge them our wholehearted and enthusiastic support. I hope the resolution will be adopted unanimously.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has gone into this thoroughly. I am sure the gentleman can tell me whether the veto applies to the seating of a country in the United Nations General Assembly.

Mr. BENTLEY. I understand that the veto does not apply to a seat in the General Assembly, but the seating of Red China would be a so-called important question which would require a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly, and I do not think the Chinese can get a two-thirds vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL].

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the resolution opposing the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. I have also presented my own resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 255, which has the same objective.

I realize that the President of the United States has already assured the people that he will advise our United Nations trustees to vote against Red China, and Secretary Dulles has done the same. However, I feel that the American people, who are so bitterly opposed to Red China, want, and should have, an affirmative stand on this matter by their Congress.

When the General Assembly of the United Nations convenes for its ninth

session in September, undoubtedly an attempt will be made to seat a representative of the Chinese Communist regime as the spokesman for China. This is a step which the United States has vigorously opposed in the past. It is a step which Republicans and Democrats alike believe we must continue to oppose as long as that government persists in violating the very principles upon which the United Nations is founded. These principles are international cooperation to develop friendly relations and maintain peace, and respect for and encouragement of human rights.

As the time draws nearer for the showdown on this issue, the question of Communist China in the United Nations will dominate the news and increasingly occupy the attention of our foreign policymakers. For this reason I would like to discuss with you the China which we are talking about when we speak of Communist China. It is the duty of each of us to decide whether that government yet lives up to the principles of the United Nations and make our views known.

As you know, the vast Chinese mainland is no longer the China which has traditionally been our friend. The Chinese people are under the yoke of a Communist dictatorship as harsh and bitter as any in Eastern Europe. We can imagine the full meaning of this when we realize that literally thousands of Chinese prisoners of war in Korea, 75 percent of the total, in fact, refused to return to their native land when given the opportunity, knowing that it meant they might never see their families and homes again. What has the Communist regime done to instill such intense hatred among the Chinese people?

For one thing, under Communist leadership China has become a nation of slave labor. It has been reliably stated that at the end of 1952 the number of slave laborers in Communist China was well over a million. China at that time, placed second only to the Soviet Union in the extensiveness of its slave-labor system. If the regime continues in power, the tragic conclusion must be reached that soon the number of forced laborers in China would even surpass that in the Soviet Union. Already some estimates of the number go as high as 5 or even 15 million.

The Communist regime does not attempt to hide the fact that it uses slave labor. On the contrary, it boasts that forced labor is a vital part of the country's economic and political structure. After a day of hard work, in which the laborer must produce a fixed quota of work of a fixed quality in a fixed amount of time, he is then subjected to political reform, in reality mental torture through which all ideas of opposition are washed away and replaced by the Communist line. That is why slave labor is an important part of the political system.

Forced labor is not the only method the Chinese Communists use to stifle political independence. Millions of Chinese who were thought to oppose the new regime have been murdered. Purges of landlords, anti-Communists, and resistant farmers have been carried out with ruthless efficiency. Mass participation

in the executions is demanded so that the crime will appear to be the result of popular demand. Even the school children are forced to attend the mock trials and cruel shootings so that they will learn the penalty of nonconformity.

Those who escape extinction or slavery are by no means free, however. They are closely watched. Their property is likely to be seized at any time. Mass propaganda is conducted continuously, and the response must be enthusiastic, vigorous, and vocal. If one member of the family is silent on the merits of communism, or expresses doubt about the validity of its teachings, another member may inform on him. It is a symbol of the degree to which the Communists are willing to undermine traditional Chinese society when children are trained to spy and report on their parents even if it means death to the parents. This violates the ties of loyalty on which the Chinese family unit is based.

The purging of the opposition is equaled only by the purging of learning. Thousands of books are forbidden because they are classed as "feudal" or "bourgeois" or "imperialistic." One source estimated that 86 percent of all books published in the 50 years prior to the Communist seizure of power have been burned. Distinguished scholars and educators have been "brainwashed" and forced to parrot the Communist teachings.

The international behavior of the Chinese Communist regime matches the terror of their domestic conduct. The most rudimentary principles of international law have been violated. The duty of protection of aliens has been grossly defied. Some hundred Americans are being held in Communist China against their will. Thirty-two of these are now in jail being held incommunicado, without trial and without knowledge of the reason for their imprisonment. Often they are subjected to physical or mental torture. Missionaries and nuns have been subjected to the same gross treatment. The aim of this shocking conduct is to secure false confessions to be used against us. As in the Soviet Union, every effort is being made to drown in a sea of "hate America" propaganda the respect and good feelings which the Chinese people themselves have had for us for over a century.

This flagrant abuse of international decency extend beyond a nonfulfillment of international obligations. It extends even beyond disgraceful participation in crimes such as promoting the narcotics trade and blackmailing overseas Chinese to gain foreign currency. Chinese Communist activities include support of outright international aggression. This, more than anything else, is likely to ignite a third world war.

As soon as they completed the conquest of the Chinese mainland, Mao Tse-tung and his underlings began an unceasing attempt to expand the scope of their influence throughout Asia. By propaganda, training leaders, and supplying money, advice, and guidance they have contributed to the development of other Asian Communist parties.

In Indochina, as we well know, it has been apparent for some time that Com-

munist China has been giving material assistance to the troops of Ho Chi Minh. A recent United States intelligence report, which has been made public, states that—

In the Viet Minh itself there are Soviet and Chinese Communist advisers or supervisors in the military organization down at least to the company level in the military and . . . spread throughout the administrative hierarchy.

It was estimated that approximately 20,000 Viet Minh troops were trained and rearmed in China in preparation for the offensive of September 19, 1950. This is only one example of the large amount of sustenance being given by the Communist Chinese to the Viet Minh.

In Korea the Chinese Communists entered a war against the United Nations itself. Here they not only attempted to help an aggressor but they defied the organization they now wish to enter. Later they disregarded accepted rules on the care of prisoners of war. Since the armistice they have repeatedly violated the terms of the armistice agreement, proving they are not yet willing to respect their international obligations. For example, the Swedish and Swiss members of the neutral nations supervisory commission have been prohibited from exercising supervision in North Korea as provided by the armistice. The provisions of the agreement prohibiting the reinforcement of military personnel, combat aircraft, armored vehicles, weapons, and ammunition have been ignored. The Communist leaders have not yet exhibited a willingness to negotiate a peaceful settlement of the Korean question in good faith.

Taken as a whole, therefore, the international conduct of the Chinese Communists no more shows interest in maintaining peace and promoting friendly relations than their domestic conduct shows respect for even elementary human rights. I cannot believe that such a government could possibly represent the Chinese people whom we have always known to be peace loving and deeply respectful of the highest values. To recognize such a regime as the legitimate government of China would, therefore, be a betrayal of the Chinese people themselves. To give it a seat in the United Nations would be a betrayal of the organization which was founded for the purpose of maintaining peace and security. Finally, such action would be a betrayal of ourselves and the principles of democracy, respect for the individual, and liberty on which the United States was founded and from which we must never deviate.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLARDY].

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, as one who introduced a resolution that goes somewhat further than that of my colleague from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY], I want to endorse what he has said and to suggest that while I would much prefer to have a stronger statement of position by this House, I am prepared to go along with the resolution now before us.

I think I should warn the Members who may come back next year that if I am successful in the coming November

election I intend to introduce on the first day of the next session a resolution which will firmly and flatly and unequivocally place this House on record as stating flatly that in the event Red China is brought into the United Nations through one door we will immediately depart by the other.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARDY. I yield.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Does the gentleman from Michigan see any difference in the nature of communism in Red China and communism in any other country?

Mr. CLARDY. I do not.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Does not the gentleman think then that this resolution would have more meaning and more sense if we opposed the entrance of any Communist nation into the United Nations?

Mr. CLARDY. Not only that, but also the ejection from the United Nations of any Communist nation. They are our sworn enemy, they are dedicated to our destruction. It is utter nonsense to call this a peace preserving organization as long as they are in our midst.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARDY. I yield.

Mr. KEARNS. Does the gentleman feel we will have proper protection in the interim until the gentleman introduces his resolution?

Mr. CLARDY. I do, or I would not support the resolution as it stands. I think that the voice this House has raised has been heard around the world because of what has transpired up until today and I am saying now that it is my interpretation of this resolution that this House is saying flatly that while we are not announcing our punch in advance, we are going to get out of the United Nations if the unexpected should happen.

Mr. KEARNS. I want to compliment the gentleman for his great conviction.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Resolution 627 as introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

This resolution is somewhat similar to those we have had previously expressing our determination to prevent the seating of Red China in the United Nations. Last year I had a similar resolution, and last year the Foreign Affairs Committee and the House of Representatives passed a similar resolution setting out our determination to prevent this coming about. Certainly nothing has happened in the meantime to make us alter this course; as a matter of fact, events in the last few months have brought us to a position where we must be even more determined.

I do not want to recognize the Communists who have raped China. I do not condone the gangster tactics they have adopted. I do not want to reward the Communists for their aggression.

A few days ago the House Committee on Foreign Affairs was considering the Bentley resolution. This resolution as first offered suggested in effect that we

have an agonizing reappraisal if the Communists are admitted as the representatives of China. It followed the general pattern to some extent of the Knowland amendment in recognizing the fact that Red China might be admitted. We must have an agonizing reappraisal if this does happen; but I do not believe in admitting defeat before we start.

We should use the veto in the Security Council and fight to a successful conclusion in case this question is brought up before the General Assembly.

I shall support this resolution. It is a positive approach in making sure that our goal is achieved, in making sure that the Communists are not seated as representatives of China.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I approve of this resolution and shall support it.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, this is perhaps one of the greatest issues that this Congress has had an opportunity to consider. It is great for two reasons: It is great because as indicated by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLARDY] already the very fact of its discussion by the United States Congress has prevented the raising of the issue of the admission of Red China to the United Nations this fall. It is great because it forces us to redetermine what kind of an organization the U. N. should be.

The elected Representatives of the people of the United States of America, both in this body and in the other body, have so fully and so firmly expressed decisively their objection to membership of Communist China in the United Nations that it has deterred action on the part of the other nations of the world who were about to take this terrible step.

It is, as indicated by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY], a step which would have wrecked the United Nations. We who have advised pulling out of the United Nations if Communist China is admitted have been accused of attempting to wreck it; but actually the day the United Nations membership falls to such a low regard for the objectives and the moral character of that organization as to admit a perfidious state like Communist China to membership then the organization is too weak morally to survive anyway.

So by the resolution that is before us today we may have accomplished one other great purpose. We may have accomplished a focusing of the attention of the American people on the question of what kind of an organization should the United Nations be.

Should the United Nations be an organization of like-minded States that have certain minimum standards for admission, or should the United Nations be a common brawling ground with no standards of admission, a place where even the worst type of nation can go and have an arena to stage its brawls with

the other countries, an arena that is short of the battlefield?

I prefer to think of the United Nations in the first sense, that it is something more than an arena. But if it is no more than that and if the awareness of the people of the United States can come to understand that it is just an arena and not an organization which is going to save the world, then what the gentleman from Michigan wants to do, reexamine our attitude toward the United Nations, is exactly the thing that should happen. If it is not an altruistic organization but an arena then we most certainly should reexamine our policies and thereafter look at it as an arena and not an altruistic organization. In doing so the United States can certainly make greater and more realistic use of it than it does at the present time.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Would not the gentleman agree that so far the record of the United Nations has proven that it is nothing but a brawling arena?

Mr. HOSMER. I will admit that the record of the United Nations is a disappointing one, in many respects, but I certainly do not give up all hope that through it we can attain a better world.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I agree with the gentleman that this resolution causes proper discussion of what the United Nations ought to be. But, of course, that is an academic question in reality because the United Nations operates under a charter which determines what it is. That charter says "membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states." Therefore, to admit to membership organization or nations which are openly at war with the United Nations itself would make a mockery of every single basic principle on which the U. N. is founded and violate the specifications clearly set forth in the charter. I commend the gentleman for the point he is making that to admit China would not strengthen the U. N.; it would destroy its moral foundation and its legal integrity, because it would be an open and blatant violation of the charter. Obviously, that would destroy its effectiveness.

Mr. HOSMER. As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] so well pointed out at the Foreign Affairs Committee hearings last Friday, admission of the Communist Chinese to the United Nations would accomplish nothing more than immediately to make them subject to expulsion for violation of the rules of that organization.

The basic fact we start out with is the perfidy of the Communist regime which kidnapped the mainland of China by murder, subversion and intrigue and which, as the President has stated:

First. Is still at war with the United Nations over Korea;

Second. Has been condemned by the United Nations as an aggressor for part in the Korean war;

Third. Still occupies parts of North Korea;

Fourth. Is now seeking to enslave the people of Indochina;

Fifth. Holds American war prisoners and American civilians unjustifiably.

If the U. N. is to be an alliance of like-minded states functioning under certain minimum standards of decency, then, obviously, the Red regime in China is far below the minimum. Should the members of the U. N. be so insensitive to the nature of that organization, portrayed by this concept, as to admit Red China we can only reach one conclusion: It is not an alliance of decency, its morals are decadent, or nonexistent, and it is no place for the United States of America to be. The greatest harm that we can do ourselves and the cause of freedom everywhere is to compromise on great moral principles. Therefore, upon such event, we should forthwith withdraw from membership.

If, on the other hand, we conceive the U. N. to be a meeting ground for all nations, irrespective of the base character of governments represented, the situation is different. We then conceive of the U. N. as a common brawling ground, something like the arenas of ancient Rome, where contestants, no matter how crude, indecent, or immoral, can stage their spectacles for all to see.

The latter concept requires a reexamination of our policy toward the United Nations. I believe our policy toward the U. N. up to now has been based on the concept of that organization being something more than a common brawling ground. Certainly, if it is only that, then our policy toward it should be reexamined. If it is no more than a place of conflict for divergent nations of whatever character, then, recognizing it as such, we possibly can obtain much more use of it than we are getting at the present time.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution. As I have frequently stated, I am opposed to any nation shooting its way into the United Nations. Red China by its actions has shown that it cannot conscientiously subscribe to the fundamental purposes of a peaceful world under the United Nations. To my mind, it is an absolute prerequisite to any nation's membership in the family of nations that they demonstrate by their deeds and not just by their words that they subscribe to the basic principles of international morality and that they pursue peaceful purposes. Instead, Red China by all of its actions has shown its devotion not to the fundamental concepts of the United Nations but rather to the concept of aggression engineered and directed by the Kremlin.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation to state the position of the Congress against the seating of the Communist regime to represent China in the United Nations. I believe it should be pointed out that the seating of Communist China regime in the United Nations would not only seat them as members of the General Assembly but would likewise seat them in the Security Council as one of the five permanent members. That would mean 2 Communist permanent members of the 11-country Security Council, which I believe could be a danger to this country and to its security.

Secondly, when we are speaking of seating this particular group in charge of the Chinese Communist regime, we would be admitting these representatives into our country through the United Nations and the United Nations buildings in New York City. Thus these Communist Chinese representatives would probably have access to the whole of the United States of America with little or no restriction, and we might have very little chance to restrict the numbers. On the contrary, there would be no American representation or travel permitted in Red China. So, on security grounds likewise I favor this resolution.

I believe this is a resolution in support of the President's position and the President's policy against the seating of the Communist regime to represent China in the United Nations. I believe that on foreign policy matters, where communism and its menace to this country are involved, we are neither Republicans nor Democrats but are acting as good loyal United States citizens in carrying out our United States foreign affairs policy, and in protecting the security of this good country of ours.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, before beginning on the few remarks that I care to make out of order, I do wish to say that I am in full sympathy with the purposes of this resolution. But, as to the remarks that I wish to make out of order, my colleagues, it is on a subject that concerns every Member in every district of the United States.

In the forepart of next week, Monday or Tuesday, there will be introduced in the House an omnibus bill recommending various constructions on the rivers and harbors of the United States. Among these there will be recommended the construction of two dams out in my district in Kansas, the cost of which is \$38,792,000 for a dam at Milford, Kans., on the Republican River, and \$16,263,000 for a dam at Perry, Kans. Now, these are small rivers but with wonderful river valleys and as fine farmland as there is in the United States. The people who live out there, the people of my district, are absolutely opposed to the construc-

tion of these dams. This is a duplication of the situation that brought me here to Congress when it was recommended that Tuttle Creek Dam near Manhattan should be constructed. That was the sole issue in my district in which I was elected as the first Democrat that ever came from that district, so you may know that there was something behind that issue. The issue in regard to these proposed dams at Perry and Milford is identical with that in regard to Tuttle Creek.

Mr. Chairman, I am taking advantage of this opportunity to call this matter to the attention of the House, because when this bill comes before the House next week it is my intention to offer an amendment to delete these two dams from the bill. It is not that the people of my district object to protection for the people living on the Kansas River valley, but that there is a better, more practicable way to do it. Upstream watershed development, already underway in the upper Delaware River area, is proving big dams on the lower river channel to be unnecessary, and, from the standpoint of flood prevention, antiquated.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Resolution 627, and wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] upon the foresight he evidenced many months ago when he first introduced this resolution.

I do not consider, as some may, that the resolution before us today constitutes in any way a threat directed at anyone. Tonight and tomorrow morning, throughout the world, the peoples of the earth and the legislative representatives of those people will learn by press and by radio and by every other means of communication that the House of Representatives, representing the collective opinion and the consensus of 160 million Americans, has voiced its unalterable opposition to the recognition of international banditry.

It may be that some others have forgotten the crosses that mark the graves of those who fell in Korea. This resolution will be evidence to the world that the United States has not forgotten the 25,000 or more crosses which mark the price that we paid for our participation in that theater of war. We have not forgotten our men, their hands wired behind their backs and their brains blown out.

International banditry, rape, brutality, violence such as the civilized world has not known for a thousand years have been perpetrated by the Chinese Communist government. That government has no place in the councils of decent and honest men.

It is my very sincere hope that when the rollcall comes upon this resolution, it will represent the unanimous voice of this great forum of opinion.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I am unalterably in favor of this resolution.

I loathe communism and all its works. I do not think China should now be admitted into the United Nations. I believe we are right in our firm conviction to refuse recognition to Red China.

I am very happy to note that this resolution is not a meddlesome interference with the prerogatives of the President. The President, under the Constitution, is the architect of our foreign policy. It is well to recognize that power given to him by the Founding Fathers, and supported by the country and its people for over a hundred and fifty years. However, we have too often members of either body presuming to act as sole shapers of our foreign policy.

However, it is pertinent to ask one or two questions. We do not recognize China; we reject her admission into the United Nations. There must be a reappraisal beyond that. It may be agonizing, it may be difficult, but the reappraisal must be had with reference to Asia, particularly with reference, for example, to Japan. It is well known that a vast quantity of goods was sold to China by Japan before the Second World War. China was Japan's best customer. What shall be our policy with reference to Japan's trade with China or Russia or the satellite countries? We are pouring great wealth into Japan to bolster its economy and bridge the gap between its exports and imports. I now ask, What is to be the policy of the administration concerning Japan? We are on the horns of a dilemma. We either have to keep pouring that wealth into Japan or in the alternative allow Japan to trade. We cannot take all of Japan's surplus goods. Japan presently is bursting at the seams with her manufactured products. What is to happen to those products? The answer must be had and soon.

It is difficult if not imprudent to have any entity or any persons shape our foreign policy except the President of the United States, in whom we must have confidence. Foreign policy cannot be formulated in this Chamber. Men who have their eyes on the next election too often may be actuated by sensation rather than by sanity, by passion rather than patience. Getting reelected and pandering to the groundlings prevents too often a statesmanlike approach. For that reason, as I said before, I am happy to note that this resolution supports the President in his present firm and expressed determination to use all means to prevent representation of China in the United Nations. I take it the President could have different views depending upon the shape of world events in the future. If the President at some distant time feels that his plan and his policy vis-a-vis China must be reoriented, I think that the expression of that reorientation or change of view and implementation thereof would be perfectly consistent with this resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has raised a question that is going to pose one of our greatest headaches, that of Japan. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that this great organiza-

tion known as the United Nations, so steeped in morality, that the other 59 member nations are going to come to the financial assistance of Japan along with the United States. Will not the gentleman agree that with all their morality they are now going to take the goods of Japan and help us finance that country?

Mr. CELLER. I do indeed hope the gentleman is correct. I do indeed hope the United States will not be alone in helping Japan.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I am for this resolution precisely because it contains no threat to withdraw from the United Nations. If it contained such a threat, I would be against it on the ground that the threat to leave the U. N. is more inimical to the interests of the United States than the unanimous declaration of the House of Representatives—a declaration already made by the Congress before and by the President and Secretary of State recently—that they are against the admission of the Communist Chinese regime to represent China in the United Nations, a view which I hold very strongly and have held from the beginning. Incidentally, I think we ought to keep to that name of the Chinese Communist regime. It is not the Government of Communist China, it is a regime which has put a yoke of slavery around the neck of China and its people.

It strikes me that the very same people that are found running down the United Nations and saying it is no good and not worth anything are the ones who turn around when something happens like that in Indochina and say, "Where is the United Nations? Why isn't it doing something?" Also, the very same people who say we should not trade with the Communist world are the very people who ask the question, "What do we do now?" and are unwilling to be for greater and more open trade when we run into a question of free world trade, and are also unwilling to help finance the economic dislocation which the free world would suffer if nonstrategic trade with the Communist bloc were entirely cut off. Our responsibility is to the 1,600,000,000 people of the world who remain outside of the orbit of the Communist countries. Instead of subjecting Japan, a great nation, to the blandishments of trade with totalitarian countries like Communist China we should be working hard to integrate economically the trade and development of the free world and to open up vast new markets based on greater development and higher standards of living.

I do not think we ought to have a foreign policy by threat. I think the reason we are here today reiterating our determination in this resolution is that some feel that confidence in American leadership has been momentarily shaken. Confidence in American leadership is based upon the moral power and the moral conviction of the American people. We must have confidence, too, in other free peoples, that they are just as honest and just as moral and just as sincere as we are, and that they, too,

will not let the Communist Chinese regime shoot its way into the United Nations—which is all it amounts to—and have the rest of the world undertake a colossal appeasement of them. Because all the Communist Chinese say is, "We want to get in the U. N. and then maybe we will be good boys." But the Communist Chinese regime fails in any way to cease its aggression and barbarous depredations against the whole civilized world. I am for this resolution expressly because it does not contain a threat but relies on the justice of the cause of the free peoples and their moral power backed up by organization, and I think the House ought to support the resolution unanimously.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY].

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very interesting that the committee report on this resolution, which I, of course, favor along with, I believe, every other Member of the Congress has this to say: "The events of the last 6 months have proved the necessity for giving increased consideration to this matter. The concern of our Government and our people has been heightened by the Geneva Conference, and the carefully planned activities of the Communist Chinese leaders and their cohorts throughout the world to develop support for their efforts to acquire the seat now occupied by the representative of Nationalist China."

Of course, the resolution itself says that the House of Representatives "reiterates" its opposition to the seating of Red China in the United Nations. I believe it is very singular that 6 months is the time set forth in this resolution because I have spent a great deal of time out among the people of California in the last 6 months, and I have rarely seen them so nervous over the foreign policy of any administration or as confused as they are over the policies of the present administration and particularly its activities during the last 6 months.

I remember well my own feeling not too many months ago when I saw a statement by Secretary of Defense Wilson that we were going to withdraw our troops from Europe. That was followed the very next day by a statement by Secretary Dulles that we would not withdraw our troops from Europe, and it was followed a little bit later by a statement by President Eisenhower that our troops would be left there so long as they were needed to defend Western Europe. He made that statement in order to try to encourage the signing of the European Defense Pact.

When you think back over all the great promises of 1952, and think of the great strength that the United States was going to have, if we had a new administration and the great new foreign policy that we were going to have, and when you see the floundering around today and the ineffective attempts the administration is making to carry out the policy that was charted by the Democrats for the European Defense Pact, then you no longer wonder at the confusion of the American people.

The administration, during the campaign of 1952, made a great political issue out of Korea. It was perfectly evident, even then, to every thinking person that Korea and Indochina were two ends of the same battlefield, and if we took the pressure off the Communists in Korea, it was perfectly obvious that they could shift their emphasis and their power to the important area of Indochina. Yet, when that very thing happened, a few months later, this administration acted surprised and the Secretary of State went rushing around to the capitols of the world to try to arrange some kind of an agreement. Our people were not even told at the time what kind of an agreement he was trying to make with our friends. It was suspected that he was trying to get an agreement to intervene in Indochina. Yet, at the same time that this was being done the military power of the United States had been drastically cut back.

The Air Force program was first cut back and then delayed for 2 years when the administration attempted to return to the very program that they scrapped when they first came into office. While they were doing this, it was announced that the Army of the United States was being cut back from 20 divisions to 17 divisions, and at the same time the administration was talking about intervention, and probably ground intervention in Indochina. They did not say with what or how they would intervene. We did not have much help in Korea except from the South Koreans who certainly were valiant in their own defense. Who would have been able to help us in Indochina if our allies had agreed to intervene? We had five divisions tied up in Europe by agreement and 7 stuck on fly paper in the Far East that could not safely move. What was the administration going to use? What were they going to use to intervene in Indochina?

We had only five Army divisions left to defend the United States and keep our farflung commitments which the administration is expanding all over the world. It was nothing but a bluff of this administration that I submit fooled the American people and confused them, but it did not confuse the Communists. Under the weak and confused leadership of this administration the Communists have marched on to greater strength and victories in Berlin and in Geneva, to the point where the Secretary of State is not willing to go to Geneva to face another diplomatic defeat. So growing Communist power, aggressiveness, and strength has been the answer to Republican sloganizing, weakness and confusion. Republican statements, I repeat, have misled our own people but have not fooled the Communists. It is time for this administration to set a clear-cut policy and tell the American people what it is, and then we will not be so nervous about the Communists shooting their way into the United Nations. All of us are against that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER].

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity the gentleman from Minnesota has given me to express without reservation my wholehearted support of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] in excluding Communist China from the United Nations.

I would like to say with reference to the statement made by the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY], that to date we have gained more by our foreign policy under our great President and our Secretary of State than in many years in the past. In the speech he has made against the administration the gentleman from California is completely missing the truth as to the accomplishments that have been made.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RADWAN].

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Chairman, in April of this year I introduced a resolution similar to the one before us today. It was very gratifying indeed when the House Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, took up the resolution before us:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives reiterates its opposition to the seating of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the United Nations or any of its specialized agencies and supports the President in his expressed determination to use all means to prevent such representation.

I vigorously urge the adoption of this resolution. Certainly the events of the last 6 months have proved the necessity for giving increased consideration to this matter. The concern of our Government and of our people has been heightened by the Geneva Conference and the carefully planned activities of the Chinese Communist leaders and their cohorts throughout the world, who develop support for their efforts to acquire the seat now occupied by the representative of Nationalist China.

Early this year I stated, and today I want to bring to the attention of this great House of Representatives, that there is a growing apprehension among the American people that we could be moving in the direction of another Yalta. I have a strong conviction that Red China should not be admitted into the United Nations. My feelings in this matter are reinforced from time to time by letters I receive from my constituents, vigorously opposing any recognition of the outlaws who now rule close to 500 million Chinese.

Unanimous expression by this body, reflecting the solid view of the American people, will serve notice to the world that the position of the United States is clear and unequivocal, and that our free Government will not compromise a sacred principle. In the cold shadow of America's 32,000 Korean war dead, it seems a little short of sacrilegious to propose that the captive government of Red China be allowed to shoot its way into the United Nations.

Adoption of this resolution will have the effect of assuring the American people that the present administration, as well as the legislative branch of our

Government, stands united in support of the principles of the free world.

I am glad that the language contained in the resolution makes reference to President Eisenhower's recent strong statement on this issue, and I am happy to support my President in his expressed desire and determination in this matter.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, when President Roosevelt agreed to recognize the Soviet Union, Maxim Litvinoff, Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs, agreed on behalf of his government "not to permit the formation or residence on its territory of any organization or group—and to prevent the activity on its territory of any organization or group, of representatives or officials of any organization or group—which has as an aim the overthrow or the preparation for the overthrow of, or the bringing about by force of a change in, the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its territories or possessions." In effect, this was a solemn agreement on the part of President Roosevelt and the Soviet Union to outlaw Communist organizations and activities in the United States.

The duplicity with which Litvinoff entered into this agreement may be judged from his gleeful account of the negotiations as he gave it to his associates, D. H. Dubrowsky, former head of the Russian Red Cross; Boris Skvirsky, attaché of the Soviet Embassy; and Peter A. Bogdanov, chairman of the board of directors of the Amtorg Trading Corporation. When Litvinoff met these men only a few minutes after the conclusion of negotiations for the recognition of the Soviet Government by the Government of the United States, he entered, all smiles, with the remark, "Well, it's all in the bag." He rubbed his hands with satisfaction, as he added: "They wanted us to recognize the debts we owed them and I promised we were going to negotiate. But they did not know we were going to negotiate until doomsday." Litvinoff continued sarcastically: "The next one was a corker; they wanted us to give them freedom of religion in Russia. And I gave it to them. I was very much prompted to offer that I would collect all the Bibles and ship them out to them."

When Dubrowsky testified before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, he explained:

You see, the general motive is that any promise given to a bourgeois state is not worth the paper it is written on.

The ink had hardly dried upon that agreement when the Soviet Union began to violate it. From that day to the present, their broken pledges litter the path of our relationship with the Kremlin. The Committee on Un-American Activities has accumulated and documented scores of instances of flagrant violations of this solemn agreement, which was the basis of our recognition of the Soviet Union. It is evident from the testimony of Dubrowsky and the subsequent conduct of the Soviet Union that the Kremlin never intended to fulfill or

respect its commitment which induced President Roosevelt to recognize the Soviet Union. As I have been saying for 25 years, you cannot do business with a wicked and criminal regime conceived in iniquity, spawned by deceit, and maintained by terror and the ruthless suppression of human rights.

In spite of the clear and unmistakable purpose of the Kremlin, there are many who continue to hug the delusion that the free world can do business with Red dictatorship. The plain truth is, Mr. Chairman, as the Dies committee pointed out in its first report on January 3, 1939, the fixed and unalterable purpose of the Kremlin is to conquer the world. For reasons of expediency there have been times that the masters of Russia have shifted their tactics, but at no time have they changed their ultimate goal. World conquest remains the heart and core of the Communist creed. There was ample evidence to demonstrate this truth many years ago, but if any doubt existed then there is no room for doubt today. Once we recognize this simple truth, however unpleasant and disagreeable it is, we can shape a realistic policy to halt Communist aggression. The forces of freedom and decency have never gained any victory through appeasement of evil. The free world tried to appease Hitler with the result that he became a menace. Time and again in the history of mankind, motives of expediency have induced governments and rulers to compromise with evil and to subordinate principle to expediency. The results have always been the same. The final payoff was always much higher than would have been the case if principle had been followed and expediency rejected.

As I have previously told this House, the fatal weakness of the Red empire is its scarcity of food and fiber. Through slave labor and terroristic methods the Kremlin has been able to produce military armaments. It has utterly failed to produce food and fiber. The collectivistic farms are being abandoned throughout the Red empire, and agriculture as the basic industry has virtually collapsed. Even the ingenuity of the commissars has failed to devise tortures sufficiently frightening and effective to compel farmers to produce a surplus. Consequently, the great crack in the Soviet armor is its desperate need for the basic essentials of life. This is the Achilles' heel of the Red monster. It is for this reason that the Soviet Union is making a desperate effort to trade with the free world. Through slave labor their gold mines have been worked feverishly and unremittently to produce the gold with which to buy from the free world. Thus, the free world has been presented with an eleventh hour opportunity to redeem the stupid blunders which led to Soviet aggrandizement. An embargo placed upon the exportation of all goods and commodities to the Red countries would do more to halt Soviet aggression than all the resolutions in the world. I realize, of course, Mr. Chairman, that the free world would have to pay a high price. I know how important it is for the non-Communist countries to trade. I know that it

will cost the United States a great deal to support a realistic policy of refusing to trade with the Red bloc. I can assure you, however, that in the end the cost of such a program would be a fraction of what we will have to spend in blood and resources to save the world and ourselves from Communist domination.

I read in the papers a few days ago that the Commission of Governors, which included our own Texas Governor, made a report to the President in favor of trade between Japan and Red China. I am unalterably opposed to this recommendation. If it is adopted, it will mean that the ruthless masters of China will be able to maintain and strengthen their hold upon the unfortunate peoples of that country. It will mean that Communist influences and propaganda will infiltrate Japan to such an extent that Japan may join the Red bloc in the not too distant future. Japan will become dependent upon the Red regime. With the flow of goods would come the flow of propaganda and insidious influences. This recommendation of the governors is contrary to what I have been preaching on the floor of this House for some time. When the bill providing for the disposition of surplus agricultural commodities abroad was under consideration in the House, I offered an amendment to prevent the beneficiaries of our bounty from trading with the Red countries. That amendment was defeated but several of my amendments were adopted to keep the bill from being used to stimulate trade with the Soviet Union and her satellites.

Mr. Chairman, the madmen who rule Russia will stop at nothing to achieve their fanatical determination to conquer the world. They will employ every means at their command to accomplish this goal. A Member of this House recently assured an audience that the Communist dictatorship would not use the A and H bombs in the event of war. Such an assurance is based upon the false premise that the Soviet rulers are normal people and are influenced by normal motives. By this time every Member of this House should have learned differently.

Out of all the mass of detailed evidence which has been presented to the Committee on Un-American Activities, there has emerged one fact, the importance of which probably exceeds that of all others: The Communist regime is an agency for the planning and perpetration of high crimes. The Communist criminal is not an ordinary criminal even when he is committing ordinary crimes.

The extraordinary thing about a Communist crime is that it rests upon an elaborate philosophy which is summed up in the doctrine that the end justifies the means. If the Communists reached the conclusion that by the unannounced and sudden use of the A- and H-bombs they could destroy the United States, they would not hesitate to use these bombs. If a hot war broke out between the Soviet Union and the free world, these madmen in control of the Red empire would not hesitate to use the A- and H-bombs if in their distorted minds they decided that the use of these bombs would bring them victory.

The non-Communist countries, including our own, say that they want to stop Communist aggression. To date there has been no evidence that the free world is willing to pay the price to contain communism. The non-Communist countries are not willing to give up the temporary profits which they gain from trade with the Red empire. The wily masters of the Kremlin know full well that the free world is not ready or willing to pay the price of a realistic and effective program to halt Communist aggression. Someone quoted Stalin as saying that the non-Communist countries want peace as much as the Red countries, but that they are not as willing to risk war as are the Red countries. In spite of all past blunders, I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that a firm and unselfish policy on the part of the non-Communist countries moving in unison would roll back the Red tide. It is the supreme tragedy of this age that our real policy toward advancing communism is appeasement.

Mr. Chairman, I see no evidence that the non-Communist countries are prepared to adopt and follow a realistic program to halt the steady advance of Communist dictatorship. I am fearful that within a year all Asia will fall victim to the insatiable appetite of the Kremlin.

For 25 years the Communists have outsmarted and outgeneraled us. They are better poker players than we are. They know every move that we propose to make. They know every card in our hand. They, on the other hand, play with consummate skill. We have one ace left and they want it desperately. They must have food and fiber to keep their sprawling empire from falling apart. Therefore, they dangle before our hungry eyes the glittering prospect of profitable trade. They show us gold which was wrung from the sweat of their slaves. They propose to use the products of our farms and factories to sustain life at a minimum requirement. They propose to stockpile huge quantities to prepare for war. They want us to commit suicide by furnishing them with the one thing they need to destroy us. It is almost unbelievable that we would fall for this obvious bait when the certain result will be our own destruction.

If we could stand for 12 months with courage and resolution and say to them: "You are not going to get anything out of us, neither food nor fiber nor industrial product," the Red empire would collapse.

While I favor this resolution, candor compels me to state that it is only a very small beginning of a realistic policy that ought to be followed by this country. If we want to stop communism, let us call upon the non-Communist world to agree to an all-out embargo upon the exportation of any product to the Red empire. If we want to stop communism, let me urge the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, under the able and conscientious leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], to bring out my bill to outlaw the Communist Party and its various components of subsidiary, auxiliary, and frontal organizations.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have just filed that bill.

Mr. DIES. Well, God bless you.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, one of the hazards of the democratic way of life is that by necessity we have to air our differences out in the open. The Kremlin suffers no such handicap, for while there are dissents, those conflicts that persist are apparently settled by a firing squad.

We accept the hazard partly because of the values that are in the very process of discussion itself, and partly because we have faith in the survival of the system, no matter how severe the conflicts of opinion may be. This applies, of course, not only to our political conflicts here at home but to policy conflicts affecting relations with those allied with us in fighting world communism. The strain resulting from differences with Great Britain and France will not last.

Mr. Chairman, I think we must exert ourselves continuously to make bipartisanship in foreign policy a reality. As I indicated in my comments on the Mutual Security Act a few days ago, the question is delicate and this is not the occasion for more than a fleeting reference. In voicing a dissent when there is an honest disagreement with foreign policy proposals, we on our side must avoid the appearance of divisiveness, and, I believe we have been meeting this standard acceptably. The present perils are too great to indulge in the incriminations that sometimes emerge in an election year. The burdens of world leadership resting upon our country are so great that nothing less than the total moral and intellectual resources of both parties will suffice.

I hope that at the conclusion of this debate, it will be evident that whatever reservations there might be as to phraseology, this resolution represents the unanimous judgment of the House with reference to the efforts of Red China to secure membership in the United Nations.

Of course we oppose those efforts for the reasons that have been enumerated. We have been heartened by the assurances of the President and the Secretary of State that every instrumentality at their command will be used to prevent Communist China from having a seat in the United Nations. At the same time I concur in the President's suggestion that we avoid decisions based on an assumption that we will lose.

There is an affirmative emphasis in this resolution that is wholesome. So, with your permission, let me direct attention to its language:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives reiterates—

And that word "reiterate" is entitled to notice, too, because we have gone on record before—

its opposition to the seating of the Communist regime in China as the representative of

China in the United Nations or any of its specialized agencies—

This is the language I wish to call attention to, the concluding words—and supports the President in his expressed determination to use all means to prevent such representation.

I am happy to support this language, for I have confidence in the President of the United States and want to uphold him as foreign-policy spokesman. I believe that this represents the attitude of those who sit on our side of the aisle and at this critical time we must have a single firm voice in world affairs. We want the world to know he speaks for all of us and that differences in domestic policy are promptly forgotten when grave security questions are considered. The outlook for a united and clearly directed leadership is brighter and the Congress should sustain the Executive in these efforts.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining 2 minutes on this side to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, the other day our former Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, said that he was going to support the mutual security program despite what he described as political attacks on a former administration that made his blood boil. We on this side feel the same way now. It is a little difficult to remain quiet at this particular moment after listening to the tirade and the charges just made by the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY] against the present administration because of the truce in Korea. I think one word must be said to keep the record straight and before the people. It was not this Republican administration that pulled out MacArthur when victory was within his grasp. It was not a Republican administration which made it impossible for Van Fleet to go forward to smash the Communist forces when he and every general in Korea of whatever nationality wanted to go ahead and the Communists were becoming demoralized. It was not a Republican administration that refused to let him win when he could win, and could thereby have prevented the war in Indochina. It was not a Republican administration that turned over to General Eisenhower an enormously more difficult situation where the Communists had been given 2 years in which to recover and to build up almost impregnable defenses, 30 miles in depth. It was one thing to accept a truce in the spring of 1953 when to resume the offensive and fight to victory would have cost our American forces blood by the gallon and lives by the tens of thousands; it was quite another to have gone ahead to the victory those forces were already winning in the spring of 1951.

I think there is enough credit and enough blame on both sides without adding the sort of unjustified invective which has been hurled here today and I hope will not be indulged in again in the future by either side. But such statements as were made cannot be allowed to go unchallenged without something being said on the other side. We cannot be expected to remain silent

when charged with responsibility for the bad results of decisions made by others.

Now, Mr. Chairman, coming back to the pending resolution, some consideration ought to be given in this debate to the arguments that are made in some quarters in favor of seating Communist China in the United Nations. One has been discussed this afternoon by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], namely, that the United Nations is supposed to be a universal organization and therefore all governments that exist should be admitted. That argument is demolished by the language of the charter itself. It was not intended to be a universal organization. That was settled at San Francisco. Extensive machinery was set up in the charter to determine how nations are to be admitted, what are the credentials and qualifications they must have; also how they are to be expelled if they do not abide by their commitments under the charter.

Maybe there ought to be an international organization in which all existing de facto governments would be eligible for membership. But the United Nations is not such an organization. The purpose of this resolution is to keep the United Nations what it was intended to be or as nearly as possible what it was intended to be—a union of peace-loving states. To admit Communist China would be brazenly to convert it into a league with organized gangsters, murderers, thugs, and racketeers. We have gangsters in our country too, but we do not advocate that, just because we may have to deal with them on occasion they should therefore be brought into the FBI.

I remember last year some public officials in the State of New York were strongly criticized and impeachment demanded because they went up to Sing Sing to see one gangster; yet it is seriously proposed in some parts of the world that we should bring into the United Nations an outfit made up of the worst gangsters in history, plotting constantly against our security and our survival.

Another argument often heard is that if we will just recognize and accept the Chinese Communists into respectable society, maybe we can detach them from the Soviet Union; maybe we can drive a wedge between Peiping and Moscow; maybe we can make Titos out of Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai. That is a more subtle argument, but there is not one thing in Communist theory or Communist history or Communist practice to support it. Besides, why should the Chinese Communists break with the Kremlin if they can have all the advantages of trade and good relations with the free world and with the Communist bloc at the same time? Of all the possibilities, this is the least likely.

Mr. Churchill said here in Washington the other day that we should make "a real good try for peaceful coexistence" with the Communists. I would like to ask what it is we have been doing all these last 10 years if not a real good try. We gave the Reds Poland. It was not ours but we gave it to them anyway.

We gave them Eastern Germany. We gave them control of Manchuria. We gave them North Korea. That is exactly how we got into our present mess in Asia—by making a real good try to get along with the Chinese Reds. We gave Russia the Kurile Islands, overhanging Japan and southern Sakhalin with the only oil wells Japan had. No wonder Japan is in economic difficulties.

What more are we to be asked to do in order to make a "real good try"? Give them western Germany? Give them the Middle East and the Suez Canal? Give them the rest of Japan? Give them India? Give them Alaska? How about California?

It is incredible that anyone should be considering adding to the list of what we have already given in the vain notion that by sacrificing our own principles and those of the United Nations, and by yielding other peoples' territory, other peoples' rights, yes, even their freedom, we will win better relations with Communists or woo them away from Moscow. I should like to pull the Chinese Communists away from the Kremlin; but the way to do it is to keep the heat on and make them lose, not help them win.

There is a further answer to the argument, it seems to me, and that is this: Why would the Kremlin be moving heaven and earth, and for years, to get Communist China into the United Nations, if that would lead or enable Communist China to break with the Soviet Union? Why do you suppose Moscow and all the satellites would be trying so hard to get Communist China into the United Nations, if that would split Communist China from the Kremlin and hereby wreck all it has been doing for 30 years in steadily expanding its world conspiracy? The Soviet leaders may have made a lot of mistakes, but can anyone believe they are so stupid as to work so hard to get Red China into the United Nations in order to have it break with the Kremlin and destroy the whole Communist position in the world?

In addition to the moral reason that admission of Red China would make a cynical mockery of the principles of the U. N. Charter, and the legal reason that the Communist Chinese do not qualify for membership—we are not excluding them out of mere prejudice or arbitrariness; they have excluded themselves by their own lawless behavior—are the practical reasons. What would be the result in Asia of admitting Communist China? All of free Asia is in flux today. It has a dozen or so new governments struggling to maintain their independence. They singly do not have the strength to defend themselves one by one against Communist China. They know the free world, if united, does have the strength; it does not have the will, they know the Communist world has the will; it does not yet have the strength. I suspect the outcome of the world struggle will depend on which side, the Communist or the free world side, gets first both the strength and the will.

These countries in Asia will crumble once they are convinced the Communists are going to win. To admit Communist China to the United Nations would mean

to the people of Asia, and it should mean to us, that the Communists have already won. Let Communist China into the United Nations, gentlemen, and that will be the ball game for Asia. That is why the Kremlin wants it so desperately and offers almost any concession in order to get it.

If our relatively strong allies in Europe are willing to embrace Communist China, how can we expect young and relatively weak governments like Laos and Burma and Indonesia and India, yes, and the Philippines, to have the fortitude and the insight and the understanding and the steadfastness to stand up and defy giant Communist China. They cannot be expected to resist successfully that which the rest of the U. N. accepts.

There is one more point I should like to make if I have time. It is said by some outside that to pass such a resolution is an attempt to force other countries to our position. No; it is an attempt to persuade them to abide by the principles of the United Nations and by the commitments all of us have made under its charter.

Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of talk nowadays to the effect that we must negotiate—but how negotiate with a tiger? We must give and take, but what are we to give this time?

We must achieve peaceful coexistence with communism, but how get peaceful coexistence between normal tissue and a malignantly spreading cancer?

Mr. Chairman, what we need most to do is to rediscover and rededicate ourselves to the convictions on which our Nation was founded. The most fundamental of them all is inscribed around the inside of the Jefferson Memorial. What did he say about negotiating with tyrants? He said:

I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man.

That is what we are dealing with, the cruellest tyranny over the mind of man in all history. Whatever other countries may try to do, the United States cannot make peace—and God give us strength not to make peace—with tyranny.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the Clerk will read the resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives reiterates its opposition to the seating of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the United Nations or any of its specialized agencies and supports the President in his expressed determination to use all means to prevent such representation.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the only reason I am imposing myself on the committee at this time is that I, with some of my colleagues, have recently returned from Europe, after having spent 4 weeks there as a member of the Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression against the Baltic and other satellite countries of Europe. We held hearings in London, Munich, and Berlin. I am sorry it was not possible for every Member of

the House to be present, but if the Members will take the time to read those hearings when they are published, I guarantee that they will find them many times more interesting in every respect than the 12 best books that have been written on the subject of Communist aggression.

We listened to witnesses who were the top people of the governments of these countries when the Communists took over. The conclusion of all of the witnesses—some 55 or 60 of them—was that you cannot trust the Communists and you cannot do business with them under any circumstances. Every move the Communists make is aimed toward their ultimate goal of world conquest—world domination by communism.

One could not sit and listen to these witnesses—as our committee did in various cities in the United States during the last 2 years—without coming to definite conclusions.

Incidentally, I intend to ask permission later to insert in the Record a sermon given by an Air Force chaplain on Sunday, July 4, in Berlin, to which I listened. It was broadcast over the Armed Forces Network. The title of his sermon was "Communism versus Christianity." As I considered it one of the best I have ever heard on the subject, I secured a copy for insertion in the Record.

To sum up this matter, I wish to concur with the remarks of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DRES], under whose chairmanship I had the pleasure of serving on the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1943 and 1944. Having been a student, to some degree, of this subject ever since 1921—when I made my first talk against communism—I have come to one inevitable conclusion.

There is only one way we can handle this problem without going into total war. The only way I know of—and I propose to draft and present a resolution to the House in the very near future concerning this matter—involves two courses. The first is to do everything possible to get all the nations of the free world to join the United States in cutting off diplomatic relations with the gangsters and bandits in the Kremlin. The second and more drastic—and this was touched on by one of the previous speakers today—is to enforce economic sanctions. I sincerely agree with what was said by, I believe, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DRES], although it may have been someone else: that if we could put on a complete blockade and cease all trade with the Soviet Government and the satellite nations, it would do more to wreck the program of the Kremlin for bringing about a world revolution than anything else we could do at this time.

I will support the resolution that is before us today, but I do not believe it goes far enough.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last few words, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the committee a question or two. In formulating this resolution, was any evidence obtained in the hearings that any deal had been made as a part of the Korean truce, that Red China would be recognized?

Mr. JUDD. Deal by whom?

Mr. GROSS. On the part of any of the so-called free world friends.

Mr. JUDD. I can assure the gentleman none has been made by our country. I know nothing as to what any other country may have done. I have no better sources regarding them than the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. That was not gone into by the Committee on Foreign Affairs? No evidence was obtained by the committee to the effect that any deal had been made that as a price for the Korean truce Red China would be recognized in the United Nations?

Mr. JUDD. That was gone into and we have no evidence whatsoever of any such deal. We have allies, of course, who openly advocate that Communist China be brought into the U. N.

Mr. GROSS. But no evidence that that was obtained as a part of that truce over there?

Mr. JUDD. None whatsoever.

Mr. GROSS. What is proposed to be done if Red China is seated? You must have given study to that.

Mr. JUDD. That is right. But no firm decision should be announced in advance. A good doctor when he prepares to operate has instruments ready for every eventuality, but his job is to see that complications do not occur that will require their use. If we concentrate successfully on preventing the seating of Red China in the U. N., the question of what to do should she be admitted will not come before us. I see no reason to cross a bridge before we come to the bridge.

Mr. GROSS. I think the gentleman's resolution falls far short of the mark. I think we should have gone on in this resolution and moved to get out of the United Nations if Red China is seated.

I should like to ask the gentleman another question. Why is this language in the resolution?

The House of Representatives reiterates its opposition to the seating of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China.

I refer specifically to the words "as the representative of China." Why that window dressing? Why not strike out those words and say that the House of Representatives reiterates its opposition to the seating of the Communist regime in China in the United Nations and continue with the remainder of the language?

Mr. JUDD. Because China already sits in the United Nations. The question is not the admission of China, the question is, who is to occupy the Chinese seat and represent China in the United Nations?

Mr. GROSS. You are here dealing with the Communist regime, you are not dealing with China.

Mr. JUDD. It is not a question of admission of China, Communist or Nation-

alist. It is a question of determining who is to occupy the Chinese seat in the United Nations. We are opposed to seating the Communist regime.

Mr. GROSS. Why not say as you start out to say here, "The House of Representatives reiterates its opposition to the seating of the Communist regime in the United Nations, and so forth"? Why not say that? It is simple, effective, and not susceptible of dual meaning.

Mr. JUDD. That is what we do say. Mr. GROSS. No, you add the words "as the representative of China."

Mr. JUDD. That is what the Communist regime in China would be if it were seated. How else would the gentleman describe it? It is not the Communist regime in Guatemala, it is the Communist regime in China.

Mr. GROSS. Why put in "as the representative of China"?

Mr. JUDD. To be accurate in our description of the situation. China has a seat in the United Nations. It is occupied by the legitimate Nationalist government as the representative of China. We are opposed to the Communist regime being recognized and seated as the representative of China in that seat in the United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. If I could get a good explanation from the gentleman as to why this extraneous language I would not offer an amendment.

Mr. JUDD. This is not extraneous language; it is a straight statement of the situation we face.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. BOW. I call the attention of the gentleman and the House to the fact that we already have a law which is in effect at this time containing this language which was in the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments' appropriation bill. The language is as follows:

It is the sense of the Congress that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China.

So what we are doing today is reiterating the language contained in the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments' appropriation bill.

Mr. GROSS. As I say, there is no necessity for this language in the resolution. Why not just say we are not going to accept Communist China in the United Nations—period?

Mr. BOW. That is what this resolution says. And it is already in a law which has been passed by the Congress.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, in proposing this form of resolution, our committee felt we should, in the words of the song, "accentuate the positive—eliminate the negative."

It is quite proper and effective for individual Members of either body to announce their own views as to what should be done if the Red Chinese should make their way into the United Nations. We felt, however, that this negative approach was not appropriate for official action by the House, first, because it smacked of defeatism in an issue where we are almost sure to win, and second,

because our country should not officially notify our enemies of what we will or will not do in hypothetical future situations.

As to the defeatist attitude; suppose a football coach announced before the season opened that if his team lost a big game during the season he would recommend withdrawing from the conference; that might create a psychological attitude that would cause his team to lose a sure winner.

Only 15 members of the U. N. have even recognized Red China. Every year, time after time, in many different ways, the Reds try to get the Chinese Communists in to represent China, and they are regularly voted down. This happened in 1951 when I was a delegate to the U. N. Assembly; it has happened each year since. It will happen again this year. Why should we talk about losing a contest we always win?

On the other hand, if the whole world changed, if 25 nations changed their vote, and it would take that many more to change the result, if the whole character and purpose of the U. N. changed, we should remember that, whatever else we do, we must first get the U. N. out of the United States before we get the United States out of the U. N. We cannot withdraw from the U. N. while it has its headquarters in the heart of our largest city. It would not be helpful, it is not necessary, to announce now all the actions that might be taken so as to result in the withdrawal of the U. N. from its present headquarters. Suffice it to say that this result could be arranged and must be accomplished before we would ever withdraw from the U. N.

In this resolution, no such negative course is mentioned. We accentuate the positive. We reiterate our stand and uphold the President in keeping the U. N. to its positive, useful, charted course. This resolution gives positive support to the Eisenhower positive foreign policy.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending resolution, which has for its purpose reaffirming our hard-spoken opposition to admitting Communist China to the United Nations, or to any of its specialized agencies.

Communist China has repeatedly shown itself to be unfriendly to the United States. It has shown itself to be unfriendly to the concept of world peace—the fundamental purpose of the United Nations is to maintain peace.

Communist China has stirred up trouble in the world and has been the agency through which thousands of American boys lost their lives and through which more thousands of American boys were wounded in Korea. Its aggressive spirit has cost this Nation billions of dollars.

To its guilt as a declared aggressor in Korea has been added Red China's efforts to take over Indochina. In addition, Mao and his government have refused to conclude a peace in Korea—as a result, the country is technically still at war with the United Nations. It is inconceivable to me that, under these circumstances, Communist China could possibly be admitted to the U. N.

The chief argument advanced in favor of seating Red China in the United Nations seems to be that such a step might bring about a change of heart on the part of these Communists. I say to you, in answer to this flimsy excuse, that the United Nations was fashioned as, and is, an international organization dedicated entirely to world peace—it is not a reform school.

President Eisenhower is the President of the United States, and thus the President of all of our citizens. Though I am a member of another political party, I recognize the responsibility of the President and of his Secretary of State for carrying on the foreign policy of this great Nation.

The President has expressed his determination to use all the means at his disposal to prevent the Communist regime of China from being seated in the United Nations. I agree wholeheartedly with his stand.

He is entitled to a bipartisan support on his stand. I am happy to pledge him my support on this issue. I hope that every Member of the House of Representatives will do likewise.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, we are today discussing a resolution, the substance of which has lately met with treatment on the front pages of practically all of our newspapers and has been the subject of careful appraisal by many thoughtful citizens. The spirit of this measure is that we deny to Communist China the privilege of a seat in the United Nations.

Despite the sweet prompting of pressure groups, and what they might have to say to the contrary, the United Nations was set up as an organization which would be comprised of peace-loving nations, with her councils available only as necessary means to the attainment of that peace, not as forums in which irresponsible and contentious groups of international pirates might hawk their wares of disunity, hate, and dishonesty.

What possible argument could there be in favor of Communist China's admission? Are our memories so short that we forget the atrocities she has perpetrated in Korea and Indochina? Are we unaware of what she stands for and what she has stood for in the past? Are we operating under the delusion that she is just another Peck's Bad Boy who, given a chance and in good time, will begin behaving himself? Are we unmindful of the lessons that the schemers of communism are teaching every hour of every day in the occupied sections of the world, a philosophy of deceit, cruelty, and slavery of men's minds and souls?

A look at the record should be enough to convince us that the Communists are tough, shifty, and undependable.

After looking at the record, it should not be difficult to determine what their plans are for the future.

World domination is the ultimate goal of the Marxist-Lenin-Stalin ideology, whether it is the Russian or the Chinese brand.

The unanimous action today of the House of Representatives is clear indication of how the American people feel about this matter.

We will not be browbeaten into doing something that goes so clearly against the spirit and purpose of the United Nations and against the interests of our own country.

World peace may well depend upon whether we stand firm in the matter of admitting Red China into the U. N. Our own sense of decency and justice requires that we make our position unmistakably clear, for neither economic considerations nor a glittering appeal to questionable security will dissuade us from the moral ideals to which we have dedicated our lives, our fortunes, and our Nation's well-being.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, in supporting this resolution I would remind the Chinese people that it is not they, but their unyielding imperialist leaders whose determination to force their way into the United Nations we are unwilling to recognize.

These leaders, misguided by the treacherous and power-seeking men of the Kremlin, have consistently disregarded all the rules of international warfare and openly defied the United Nations as an opponent of aggression and an instrument of peace.

As a member of the United Nations, the United States cannot approve the admission of China to this international institution created for the primary purpose of maintaining peace.

The Chinese people are not imperialist minded. This has been proven by many centuries of recorded history.

Under responsible democratic leaders China will once more assume her rightful place among the leading peace-loving nations of the world.

When shown this is being attempted, America will not only welcome China into the family of nations, but will, as she has traditionally done in years past even with her defeated enemies, extend freely of her material and spiritual resources to restore the Chinese people to self-government and a more abundant life.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 1, line 3, after the word "China", strike out the words "as the representative of China."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to labor this point, but I simply want to reiterate there is no reason for extraneous language in the resolution. There should be no qualification of any kind. If we are going to adopt this proposal, let us say simply and effectively that we are opposed to the seating of the Communist regime in China in the United Nations. Then, go on with the rest of the language as it is in the resolution.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. If the gentleman's amendment were accepted, would he then vote for the resolution?

Mr. GROSS. I am going to vote for the resolution although I feel that it falls far short of what we ought to say.

Mr. FULTON. I want to accommodate the gentleman. But is it important

enough that you would say you would vote against the resolution, if this particular language is in it?

Mr. GROSS. No, I will not vote against it with that language, but I see no reason for it. Let us make it as effective as possible.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Does the gentleman understand that China, the republic we recognize, the country, the nation of China, is now a member of the United Nations and the whole issue is not whether China shall be a member of the United Nations, but who shall represent China in the United Nations. The gentleman is striking out the important issue here.

Mr. GROSS. No, no, that is not the issue and the gentleman knows it. There is only one Communist regime in China, and the gentleman well knows that. You would not in any way jeopardize the nationalist government of China.

Suppose the United Nations should adopt a motion, as a first step, recognizing Communist China as the representative of China. You would regret ever having put such language in this resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks made by my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd]. I am in complete agreement with everything he said except his preliminary remarks, which I will not refer to on this occasion. The gentleman and I have been very much interested for some years in the situation and the matter which is before the House now. As a matter of fact, we were two of a small group which comprised the sponsors of the committee of 1 million where a million signatures were obtained throughout the entire United States opposing the admission of Red China into the United Nations.

I want to ask the acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs a question because I think it is important for the record. This resolution states that it "supports the President in his expressed determination to use all means to prevent such a representation." Secretary Dulles within the past week has stated that the United States, if it desired, could use the double veto in the Security Council, that is correct, is it not?

Mr. JUDD. That is correct, so I am informed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is this resolution to be construed that it is the intention of the committee and of the House upon its adoption that if it is necessary for our country to use the double veto it should be done?

Mr. JUDD. Yes. We discussed in committee whether the resolution should read that we support the expressed determination of "The President and the

Secretary of State," in order to make sure that it includes the statement of the Secretary on the use of the veto in this case. It seems clear that the term "President" is inclusive of the Secretary and other responsible officers and their official statements. Mr. Dulles has said we would use the veto and that means this administration has declared that as its position. That is our understanding, when the resolution speaks of using "all means."

Mr. McCORMACK. I assumed that was so, but I thought the record should show whether my assumption was correct, that if a situation ever arises where the exercise of the double veto on the part of our country is necessary, this resolution contemplates its exercise.

Mr. JUDD. That is our understanding.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises. Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the resolution (H. Res. 627) reiterating the opposition of the House of Representatives to the seating of the Communist regime in China in the United Nations, pursuant to House Resolution 634, he reported the resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the resolution.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 381, nays 0, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 105]

YEAS—381

Abbott	Boykin	Crumpacker
Abernethy	Bramblett	Cunningham
Adair	Bray	Curtis, Mass.
Addonizio	Brooks, Tex.	Dague
Albert	Brown, Ga.	Davis, Ga.
Alexander	Brown, Ohio	Davis, Tenn.
Allen, Calif.	Brownson	Davis, Wis.
Allen, Ill.	Broyhill	Dawson, Utah
Andersen,	Buchanan	Deane
H. Carl	Budge	Delaney
Andresen,	Burdick	Dempsey
August H.	Burleson	Derounian
Andrews	Bush	Devereux
Angell	Byrd	D'Ewart
Arends	Byrne, Pa.	Dies
Ashmore	Byrnes, Wis.	Dingell
Aspinall	Campbell	Dollinger
Auchincloss	Campfield	Dolliver
Ayres	Cannon	Dondero
Bailey	Carlyle	Donohue
Baker	Carnahan	Donovan
Bates	Carrigg	Dorn, N. Y.
Battle	Cederberg	Dorn, S. C.
Beamer	Celler	Dowdy
Becker	Chatham	Doyle
Beicher	Chelf	Eberhart
Bennett, Fla.	Chenoweth	Edmondson
Bennett, Mich.	Chipperfield	Elliot
Bentley	Chudoff	Ellsworth
Bentsen	Church	Engle
Berry	Clardy	Evins
Betts	Clevenger	Fenton
Bishop	Cole, Mo.	Fernandez
Blatnik	Cole, N. Y.	Fine
Boggs	Colmer	Fino
Boland	Condon	Forand
Bolling	Cooley	Ford
Bolton,	Coon	Forrester
Oliver P.	Cooper	Fountain
Bonner	Corbett	Frazier
Bosch	Cretella	Frelighuysen
Bow	Crosser	Friedel
Bowler		Fulton

Gamble	Krueger	Riehlman
Garmatz	Laird	Riley
Gary	Landrum	Roberts
Gathings	Lane	Robeson, Va.
Gavin	Lanham	Robison, Ky.
Gentry	Lantaff	Rodino
George	Latham	Rogers, Colo.
Golden	LeCompte	Rogers, Fla.
Goodwin	Lesinski	Rogers, Mass.
Gordon	Lipscomb	Rogers, Tex.
Graham	Lovre	Rooney
Granahan	McCarthy	Sadlak
Grant	McConnell	St. George
Green	McCormack	Saylor
Gregory	McCulloch	Schenck
Gross	McDonough	Scherer
Gubser	McIntire	Scrivner
Gwinn	McMillan	Scudder
Hagen, Calif.	McVey	Secrest
Hagen, Minn.	Machrowicz	Seely-Brown
Hale	Mack, Ill.	Selden
Haley	Mack, Wash.	Shafer
Halleck	Madden	Sheehan
Hand	Magnuson	Shelley
Harden	Mahon	Sheppard
Hardy	Marshall	Short
Harrison, Nebr.	Mason	Shufford
Harrison, Va.	Matthews	Sieminski
Hart	Meador	Simpson, Ill.
Harvey	Merrill	Simpson, Pa.
Hays, Ark.	Merron	Small
Hays, Ohio	Metcalfe	Smith, Kans.
Hebert	Miller, Calif.	Smith, Miss.
Herlong	Miller, Kans.	Smith, Va.
Heseltun	Miller, Md.	Smith, Wis.
Hess	Miller, Nebr.	Spence
Hiestand	Mills	Springer
Hill	Molichan	Stagers
Hillelson	Morano	Stauffer
Hinschaw	Moss	Steed
Hoeven	Moulder	Stringfellow
Hoffman, Ill.	Multer	Sullivan
Hoffman, Mich.	Mumma	Taber
Hollfield	Murray	Talle
Holmes	Natcher	Taylor
Holt	Neal	Thomas
Holtzman	Nelson	Thompson,
Hope	Nicholson	Mich.
Horan	Norrell	Thornberry
Hosmer	Oakman	Tollefson
Howell	O'Brien, Ill.	Trimble
Hruska	O'Brien, N. Y.	Tuck
Hunter	O'Hara, Ill.	Van Pelt
Hyde	O'Hara, Minn.	Van Zandt
Ikard	O'Konski	Velde
Jackson	O'Neill	Vinson
James	Omers	Vorys
Jarman	Passman	Vursell
Javits	Patten	Wainwright
Jenkins	Patterson	Walter
Jensen	Pelly	Wampler
Johnson, Calif.	Post	Warburton
Johnson, Wis.	Philbin	Watts
Jonas, Ill.	Phillips	Westland
Jonas, N. C.	Pilcher	Wharton
Jones, Ala.	Pillion	Whitten
Jones, Mo.	Poage	Wickersham
Jones, N. C.	Poff	Widnall
Judd	Polk	Wigglesworth
Karsten, Mo.	Preston	Williams, Miss.
Kean	Price	Williams, N. J.
Kearney	Priest	Williams, N. Y.
Kearns	Prouty	Wilson, Calif.
Keating	Rabaut	Wilson, Ind.
Kee	Radwan	Wilson, Tex.
Kelley Pa.	Rains	Winstead
Kelly, N. Y.	Ray	Withrow
Keogh	Rayburn	Wolcott
Kilburn	Reams	Wolverton
Kilday	Reece, Tenn.	Yates
King, Calif.	Reed, Ill.	Yorty
King, Pa.	Reed, N. Y.	Young
Kirwan	Rees, Kans.	Younger
Klein	Rhodes, Ariz.	Zablocki
Kluczynski	Rhodes, Pa.	
Knox	Richards	

NOT VOTING—53

Barden	Fisher	Ostertag
Barrett	Fogarty	Patman
Bender	Harris	Perkins
Bolton,	Harrison, Wyo.	Powell
Frances P.	Heller	Regan
Bonin	Hillings	Rivers
Brooks, La.	Kersten, Wis.	Roosevelt
Buckley	Long	Scott
Camp	Lucas	Sikes
Cotton	Lyle	Sutton
Coudert	McGregor	Teague
Curtis, Mo.	Mailliard	Thompson, La.
Curtis, Nebr.	Martin, Iowa	Thompson, Tex.
Dawson, Ill.	Miller, N. Y.	Utt
Dodd	Morgan	Welch
Durham	Morrison	Wheeler
Fallon	Norblad	Wier
Feighan	O'Brien, Mich.	Willis

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hillings with Mr. Roosevelt.
Mr. Bonin with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. O'Brien of Michigan.
Mr. Norblad with Mr. Barrett.
Mr. Curtis of Missouri with Mr. Fogarty.
Mr. McGregor with Mr. Perkins.
Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Utt with Mr. Regan.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Rivers.
Mr. Bender with Mr. Lucas.
Mr. Mailliard with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana.
Mr. Weichel with Mr. Thompson of Texas.
Mrs. Frances P. Bolton with Mr. Sikes.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Cotton with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Harrison of Wyoming with Mr. Dodd.
Mr. Ostertag with Mr. Teague.
Mr. Miller of New York with Mr. Brooks of Louisiana.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight Saturday to file a report on H. R. 9910.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO HELIUM ACT

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8713) to amend section 1 (d) of the Helium Act (50 U. S. C., sec. 161 (d)), and to repeal section 3 (13) of the act entitled "An act to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes," approved October 31, 1951 (65 Stat. 701), with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, after "operations", insert "not needed for Government use."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GUILLERMO MORALES CHACON

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2617) for the relief of Guillermo Morales Chacon, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, strike out "In excess of 10 percent thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. AUGUSTA SELMER-ANDERSEN

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6642) for the relief of Mrs. Augusta Selmer-Andersen, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until Saturday night to file reports on bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was not objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the program for next week will be as follows: On Monday the Consent Calendar will be called, and following that will be the consideration of a supplemental appropriation bill.

Beginning Tuesday and for the balance of the week—and I will say this is for the balance of the week with no definite dates set for any of these bills—the program will be as follows:

The Private Calendar.

H. R. 9757, the atomic-energy bill.

H. R. 8658, punishment of bail jumpers.

H. R. 7130, forfeiture of citizenship.

H. R. 4979, the immunity bill.

House Joint Resolution 527, to provide for the creation of a Commission on Security in Industry.

H. R. 236, the Fryingpan-Arkansas project.

H. R. 8896, multiple mineral development.

H. R. 9463, military housing.

S. 3589, the Export-Import Bank.

H. R. 9756, the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The Mutual Security Administration appropriation bill.

H. R. 9859, the omnibus rivers and harbors bill.

Of course, conference reports will be in order at any time.

By agreement entered into the other day, Wednesday will be suspension day, and suspensions will be in order on that day.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I should like to inquire as to the present status of H. R. 7840, the bill that has the backing of the 23 railroad brotherhoods, an amendment of the Retirement Act.

Mr. ARENDS. That is not on this list. I will check into it and try to inform the gentleman later.

Mr. WOLVERTON. A great many Members of the House are interested in the bill. It is rather surprising that it should have gone on as long as it has without some action being taken.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I realize it is extremely difficult for the gentleman to say when the atomic-energy bill will be considered. He has said it will come up following the Private Calendar on Tuesday. Can the gentleman say rather definitely that we may expect it at that time?

Mr. ARENDS. We have it on the program. We are waiting to see whether the other body completes action on the bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Is there any kind of understanding that there will not be a rollcall on Monday next?

Mr. ARENDS. Not to my knowledge.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to state that if there were to be a rollcall on Monday it could well be put over until the next day.

Mr. RAYBURN. Have rules been granted on all these bills?

Mr. ARENDS. No; they have not.

Mr. RAYBURN. How many days do you expect the House to be in session next week?

Mr. ARENDS. I would say that if the rules are granted and we are to complete the program it will take most, if not all of next week.

Mr. RAYBURN. In any event, it will carry us through the week?

Mr. ARENDS. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Are other bills coming up by petition, bills on which the Committee on Rules has not granted a rule?

Mr. ARENDS. I would not have any way of knowing that.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago, the House voted on House Resolution 627 by Mr. BENTLEY, opposing the seating of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the United Nations. Unfortunately, I missed the vote by a few minutes as I was testifying before the Senate Judiciary Committee in behalf of my good friend, Judge James C. Connell, of Cleveland, Ohio, who was nominated for Federal judgeship in northern Ohio district. Had I been present, of course, I would have voted for the resolutions as I have voted on a number of previous occasions when appropriation bills for the State Department were under consideration.

This same provision was contained in section 110 of Public Law 471. The Bentley resolution reaffirms the position of the American people to the request of Communist China.

Governments achieve their position in the society of nations upon the basis of their conduct. No country merits recognition today unless it demonstrates a desire to live at peace and to cooperate in the establishment of an orderly and peaceful world.

Communist China has demonstrated a complete disregard for these standards. She has instigated and encouraged aggression in Korea and Indochina. There is evidence that her agents are at work in Japan, India, and the Philippines. Her leaders have done nothing to prove an intention to establish durable peace anywhere in Asia.

To admit such a regime to the United Nations is to declare the United Nations bankrupt. No country should be permitted to shoot its way into the family of nations. I know that we speak for the people of every section of America in enacting this resolution, affirming our support of President Eisenhower's stand against the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's statement stands in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE GUNNERY MEET

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of visiting Nellis Air Force Base, at Las Vegas, Nev., during the recent United States Air Force gunnery meet. I think my colleagues would like to have a report on that meet, because it revealed so much about the fine state of readiness of our Air Force. I personally want to make such a report, as it gives me the opportunity to pay a tribute to the Air Force, based on the demonstration of proficiency, skill, and high morale I saw at Nellis.

My distinguished colleague, the Honorable LeRoy Johnson, Mr. John R. Blandford, and Mr. Philip W. Kelleher, committee counsels of the House Armed Services Committee, and I had the privilege of visiting Nellis, and witnessing the concluding events of the meet, as the guests of the Secretary of the Air Force. I am sure that I speak for us all when I say that in witnessing competitive firing by crack Air Force pilots we had a rare educational experience.

This was the first all-jet Air Force fighter gunnery and weapons meet in history, and staged not only as a measure of Air Force readiness but to demonstrate in part the most efficient and economic expenditure of budget funds through the commands. The meet was staged to demonstrate where corners can be cut in conjuring more combat potential from fixed resources, and where the edge can be taken off inefficiency in air-to-air combat, skip-and-dive bombing, panel gunnery and rocketry. All of this is important to the Air Force plan to operate the 137-wing Air Force, now 3 years off, with only 20,000 more uniformed personnel than it has in the 115 wings now operational. The meet had been in progress several days when our groups arrived making the 40-mile flight by helicopter from Las Vegas to the gunnery range at Indian Springs, just over the ridge from Yucca Flat, site of historic atomic-bomb explosions. The demonstrations of air-to-ground gunnery and rocketry went off with superb precision, and impressed all of us with the capability of the pilots. Of particular note was a fly-by involving a Spad, an F-41, an F-86, and the F-100, four planes covering almost the history of combat aviation. We were fortunate in having Congressman Johnson with us, because he, as a pilot who had flown a Spad during World War I, was able to give us the performance characteristics of that aircraft.

We were not the guests of the Air Force only but of the community of Las Vegas as well. At the meet we were given a demonstration of Air Force training, skill, proficiency, and readiness, and, as guests of the community, we were given an impressive example of the fine community relations prevailing at Nellis. Las Vegas certainly supports the Air Force and furnishes a fine example of the grass-roots aspects of national defense. There is no question about the community attitude toward the Air Force. The people out at Las Vegas know where national defense begins.

During the evening, we were guests at a western-style barbecue staged on the football field of the Las Vegas High School by the Aircraft Industries Association, the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce, and allied groups. At the conclusion of the meal, we adjourned to the school auditorium and enjoyed an entertainment program consisting of several acts from different hotels. After that program, Gen. T. D. White, Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force, presented trophies for the portions of the gunnery meet contest which had been completed.

One of the participating teams had been the 191st Fighter Interceptor

Squadron of the Air National Guard, based at Salt Lake City, Utah, and flying F-86A's. The 191st is part of the 144th Fighter Bomber Wing, composed of men from California, Utah, and Nevada, all training to provide a fully trained standby force for the protection of the United States. Team captain of the Air National Guard unit for participation in this meet was Lt. Col. George W. Edmonds, a native of Illinois, a European ace in World War II, and commander of the 144th Fighter Bomber Group since the 1st of March, this year.

The trophy for air-to-ground low-angle skip bombing and strafing went to another team member, Lt. Col. Roland R. Wright, with a score of 295 hits out of 400. Col. Wright, a native of Idaho, but now a resident of Salt Lake City, is presently commander of the 191st Fighter Bomber Squadron. I can tell you that his squadron was proud of their commander's record. General White's presentation of the trophy and his tribute to the Air National Guard team's fine performance evoked a spontaneous round of enthusiastic applause. I understand that sighting targets and shooting same is old stuff to at least two other Air National Guard competitors in the meet besides Colonel Wright. Maj. Milton R. Graham, of Wilder, Idaho, commander of the 194th Fighter Bomber Squadron, and Maj. James W. Edwards, of Reno, Nev., operations officer of the 192d Fighter Bomber Squadron, teamed up to win the Air National Guard gunnery meet at Boise, Idaho, in September 1953, and Lieutenant Colonel Wright was himself a member of the 140th Fighter Bomber Wing team that won the Tactical Air Command's gunnery meet at Eglin Air Force Base, Fla., in 1952.

The crack marksmen of the Air Training Command's team of aces came out on top by a wide margin to win overall meet honors and air-to-air gunnery in the day-fighter bracket. This Nellis-based team tallied 3,153 points, 398 more than their closest competitors. But honors were widely distributed. Second place overall honors went to a globe-girdling quartet from the Strategic Air Command, the 508th Strategic Fighter Wing. This team also took first place in air-to-ground rocketry, bombing, and gunnery events. Third place went to a team from the Far East Air Forces, with a score of 2,386 to 2,755 for second place. First place in the security-cloaked special delivery competition, a new category having to do with special weapons techniques, was won by the 20th Fighter Bomber Wing, a team from the United States Air Forces in Europe. Second place in this special competition went to the team from the 49th Fighter Bomber Wing, based in Korea. There was certainly an international character to the distribution of awards, all of which merely emphasized the farflung responsibilities and overall readiness of the Air Force.

One other matter that should be stressed is that pilot skill and grade-A support from ground crews paid off in more than scoring points during the competition. They resulted in an accident-free meet, the second consecutive all Air Force meet at Nellis to be free of

major accidents. Experience and training pay off—and they will pay off in the showdown, if it comes, just as they paid off at Nellis.

A precaution which fortunately was unnecessary during the meet was the crash barrier which was in readiness on a runway. This device, developed by the Air Force in Korea, employs an arresting gear of nylon webbing, steel cable, and 800 feet of anchor chain to decelerate jets in case of power failure on takeoff, or defective brakes, or other difficulties in landing. More than 30 combat planes used the system during a 90-day period in Korea, and since its adoption at Nellis it has saved five pilots from possible injury and prevented major damage to the aircraft. But like the two air-rescue H-19 helicopters on standby during the meet in case of accident, the crash barrier was not needed.

Gen. J. E. Roberts, who was our considerate host and commander at Nellis, made a statement in which he said:

Aside from providing us the best possible means, short of actual combat, to evaluate our personnel, training methods, and material, the gunnery meet has afforded the Air Force an ideal opportunity to demonstrate the qualities that go to make it such a fine organization.

I might add to what General Roberts said, that the meet afforded the members of your Armed Services Committee an ideal opportunity of evaluating the qualities of the Air Force commanders, and leaders, and crews that produce the Air Force in which we place so much confidence, and with such good reason.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, today marks the end of the second full year since the McConnell coal-mine safety bill became law on July 16, 1952.

I have just been advised by Mr. Harry F. Weaver, Chief, Coal Mine Inspection Branch, Bureau of Mines, that the 2 years since this law was passed have marked the sharpest decline in both fatal and nonfatal injuries in the entire history of coal mining.

As a matter of fact, there has been only 1 major disaster where 5 people were killed. There is a question as to whether or not this disaster should be charged up to the period covered by the new coal-mine safety law, because it occurred while the Federal coal-mine inspectors were under an injunction from the State court preventing them from enforcing provisions of the safety law.

Though the announced intention of the law was to prevent major disasters in the coal mines of America, it is clear that it has had the very desirable result of reducing smaller accidents as well as the major ones. An example is that 31,000 people suffered nonfatal injuries in American coal mines in 1952. In 1953 this number was reduced to 22,000.

Again, in 1952 a total of 548 people were killed in coal mines. Last year this number was reduced to 457, the smallest of any year in the history of coal mining.

This fine record is the direct result of the splendid cooperation between coal miners, their unions, mine owners and operators, State and Federal coal-mine inspectors. It is a record of which all can be proud.

INCREASE OF BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am reminding the membership that there is pending at the desk the Radwan petition to discharge the Rules Committee from further consideration of the bill H. R. 9020, a bill which would provide a 10 percent across-the-board increase for service-connected cases, for widows, orphans, and dependents, and also about a 12 percent increase to veterans of the Spanish-American War, and certain other increases for non-service-connected disability cases.

For a long time, Mr. Speaker, we have been trying to secure action, by way of a rule, suspension, or in some method, to bring this bill up. This is an extremely meritorious bill, it is a very moderate one. As a matter of fact, we cut some \$50 million from the bill as originally introduced. We have also had a regard for the Treasury of the United States and the economic conditions of our country. However, we feel that the least we can do is to give help to the veterans of our country. We feel that we should not sit here quietly in our seats and not fight for our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, there are certain other of our bills pending before the Rules Committee. I have heard intimations to the effect that rules would be granted on some of the more modest bills. I am hopeful that that may be true. I also have inferred from conversation that perhaps something might be done in reference to H. R. 9020 if it were modified. However, I am not satisfied and I will not feel satisfied completely until that legislation is passed. I do not personally see how we can cut H. R. 9020 any further.

Mr. Speaker, I was over in the other body the other day and a chairman of one of the committees that handles such legislation said: "Mrs. ROGERS, why do you not send over more bills to us. We are hungry for veterans' legislation over here."

Another committee chairman asked: "When are you going to send your legislation over to us. We would like for you to send it over."

Mr. Speaker, if we were to modify the provisions of H. R. 9020 I believe the Senate would increase them. I do not

think we should modify that bill. I think it should be taken as is.

I for one do not feel that I can go back to my veterans who are in the hospitals and say that we have done practically nothing for the veterans this year.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentlewoman says we have not done anything.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I said "practically nothing."

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Let me refer the gentlewoman to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 13, 1954, page 10441 where the gentlewoman herself said that 11 veterans' bills have been enacted into law, as reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs during the current session of the Congress. One is now pending before the President. That is 12 all told. I do not know whether they mean much or little, but I presume such a great committee as the Committee on Veterans' Affairs headed by such an excellent chairman as the gentlewoman does not bring in bills that mean nothing. The gentlewoman stated that 12 bills have been passed. I can remember a Congress when I first came here, and another party was in power, reducing the benefits for veterans 15 percent.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is no reason for saying that we should do anything to cut the veterans now.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentlewoman herself said that 12 bills have been passed during the current session of the Congress. I will leave it to the judgment of the able chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs as to whether only minor bills are reported by that committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We have brought in a number of bills involving land grants, granting to certain towns and communities land which they permitted the Veterans' Administration to have. Now they want it back and the Veterans' Administration allows them to take it back.

This House passed a direct loan bill which is still pending in the Senate. I understand that the Senator from Alabama the other day moved to add \$50 million a quarter as a grant rather than \$25 million, which was in the bill as we passed it. They have had more requests for direct loans than ever before. The bill is now a part of H. R. 7839, the so-called Housing Act of 1954, which is in conference. It is true that we passed bills granting the Philippine veterans certain privileges and rights in reference to hospitalization and so forth, and I have never seen a more grateful group.

Personally I am devoted to the chairman of the Committee on Rules; I have great admiration for him, but I realize that the gentleman's hands are often tied. I am sure he would grant rules if he did not have a lot of people trying to prevent their passage. There is a bill now before the committee granting \$200 per year increase per patient in the amount the Government pays the States for the veterans in State homes. I un-

derstand there is no objection to that, and I understand the Committee on Rules will grant a rule on it.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I cannot say what the Committee on Rules will do, but I favor that bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There is another bill to allow the Korean boys in hospitals, and some World War II veterans, even, to have money to purchase automobiles when they are discharged. I know there was no intention to debar them. They had an extension 3 years ago, and that expired, and that must be passed before they can get the \$1,600. Now, a great deal of money has been paid back to the Federal Government in the way of taxes by these veterans themselves. That is due to the increased tax that the veterans, who have jobs, pay as the result of having automobiles. On top of that, there is a tax paid on the purchase price of the automobile. If you could hear the men saying "We have a job now because we can go to and from work." I know it would make you happy. It is a great rehabilitation measure, and I think the Congress deserves a great deal of credit for passing it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad to associate myself with the gentlewoman from Massachusetts in connection with the veterans legislation that she is so deeply interested in, particularly on this occasion, in reference to H. R. 9020. On 2 or 3 previous occasions I stated in colloquy with the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, when she had the floor, that I hoped the leadership would report out a rule on that bill or even let it come up under suspension; that I was sure it would pass this House practically unanimously, if not unanimously.

Now, I was interested in the remarks made by my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. ALLEN], about some previous Congress and a reduction of 15 percent in veterans' compensation. The gentleman from Illinois is correct. I remember it very, very well, because I was a member of this body. That was back in either 1933 or 1934. It was known as the so-called Economy Act. I remember it very well, because I was one of the few Members of the House then who voted against it. And, I might say, in view of the fact that my friend from Illinois has made reference to another party being in control—of course, he meant the Democratic Party, and that is correct—that there were less than 50 Members of the House who voted against it. That meant that both Democrats and Republicans in that Congress practically overwhelmingly voted for the bill. And, I must make this observation, because I was one of the few Members who voted against the bill. I might also say that whatever harm was done was corrected in succeeding Congresses. I think it is also only fair to say that on veterans' legislation the question of partisanship has played no part, negligible at the most. We do this without regard to our party affilia-

tion. But, in connection with the bill that the gentleman did refer to, I wanted the RECORD to show what the real history was; that both Republicans and Democrats overwhelmingly voted for it, and only a very small percentage of the Members of the House at that time voted against it. And I happened to be one of them, and, frankly, my vote against that is one of the proudest votes I ever cast.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will say to the gentleman that many of the benefits were restored for the men that were cut under that bill, but a good many were not restored, and they have not received the benefits. The Director of the Budget at the time wrote a letter saying that the economy of the country was going to pieces, and he gave us the information that no service-connected cases would be cut, but they were cut. I will say to the gentleman that this year our committee was asked to pass an omnibus veterans' bill which would mean the raising of some benefits, but the curtailment of others, and our committee took no action on it. Our committee feels that we are not willing to curtail and liquidate the benefits now being given to the veterans.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I support the gentleman's position on H. R. 9020 and believe we should consider the legislation here and now before we adjourn, and I hope very much that we will. I am not at all willing to believe that we are pulling up hill. On the contrary, I feel that it is a winning, not a losing fight.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for his support. Of course, I am personally interested in this matter; not that it affects me, but it affects the veterans. Those of us who see them day in and day out know just what it means for them to have a little money, or a little bit more money. I was at the hospital the other day. There I saw boys with 3 limbs gone, or 4 limbs gone. Those boys say to me, "Mrs. ROGERS, does this mean that we cannot get the automobile money if we are not discharged before the time the bill expires? Does it mean that we are not going to get a slight increase in compensation? We are bedridden. We cannot speak for ourselves. We cannot come in and argue for ourselves." There was one boy who said something about his disability and not being able to get any compensation for it but he said, "I get used to it."

It means so very much to these boys to have something. They read stories about increases in salary for Federal employees, about increases for the men in the services and in benefits; about increases to Members for telegraph money and clerks and they cannot understand why they are not given something.

Next year I think our committee will have to object to the dispensing with the business on Calendar Wednesday every week. We might possibly get a hearing that way, although it would take 18 Wednesdays in order for us to get a hearing on our bills.

It is incredible to me that we have not even been able to get hearings by the Committee on Rules on our measures. When people see us coming, they run in the opposite direction. The only place left to discuss matters is the floor of this forum. Thank heaven for that and thank heaven for the right to petition.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I want to commend my chairman, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], for the very gallant fight she has been making during this entire session, as she always has, on behalf of the veterans of this Nation.

As the gentlewoman knows, I have always been pleased to join with her, and I am pleased now to give expression to my support of her position in this matter.

The Subcommittee on Compensation and Pensions of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs held extensive hearings during this session of Congress. It was the principal objective of the veterans' organizations of this Nation during this term of Congress to obtain a reasonable increase in cost-of-living allowances or compensation. This legislation was very carefully considered by the subcommittee. It was favorably reported, unanimously reported by the full committee. Today we are taking action to try to force the matter to the floor so that Members will be given an opportunity to vote on this proposed legislation on which I feel sure the majority of the Members of the House wish to express themselves.

I certainly want to assure the lady from Massachusetts that I am pleased to align myself with her at this time in this fight.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We are all in this together. The gentleman knows that our committee is a 14-14 committee. We have 14 Republicans and 14 Democrats on our committee. We have worked in a nonpartisan way. At this time I, as chairman of the committee, would like to thank every member of the committee for his great consideration and cooperation. It has meant a great deal to me, because the members have had such constructive views. I am only the chairman; they really run the committee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would like to associate myself with the views expressed by the chairman of our committee. I think it should be stressed again that when we come out of our committee with a bill, nearly 95 percent of the time it is by a unanimous vote.

I am very proud of the fact, to which the chairman has already referred, that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is in the truest sense a bipartisan committee. I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, our minority whip, when he made that point very clear a few moments ago. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts has pointed out that this bill, in which we are vitally interested, H. R. 9020, was considered for weeks by our

committee. We made many concessions in the committee. There was much give and take. We tried to have a proper record and studied every angle of this bill. It came out of our committee by a unanimous vote.

What is of particular concern to all of us on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs today is to try to get a rule on H. R. 9020.

I would like to thank my distinguished chairman and associate myself again with her views. I am very proud to point out the fact that there are a number of other members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs who are here and who I know are anxious to say some things about this bill, too.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, there are a number of them here. May I thank the gentleman again. There are a great many names on the petition already, although it has been on the desk only since 12 o'clock. If we had another full day, undoubtedly the full quota of names would be on the petition.

I do not know when we are going to adjourn. May I ask the majority whip when he expects the Congress will adjourn.

Mr. ARENDS. Does the gentlewoman mean today, or the end of the session?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I mean the end of the session.

Mr. ARENDS. That is problematical. I would think some time the fore part of August.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Some time in the middle of August?

Mr. ARENDS. That is only one person's guess.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In the middle of August?

Mr. ARENDS. I said the forepart of August. That is merely a guess on my part.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then we will have ample time to get all of the names on the petition and get the petition out, if we are not granted a suspension. I do not know that they will give us a rule, but if we get a suspension, we do not care by what means we get the legislation out so long as it comes up for action.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. I am glad to associate myself with the chairman of our committee, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. This is a nonpartisan bill. On every bill that comes up the whole committee votes in a nonpartisan spirit. Therefore, I wish the Committee on Rules would see their way clear to bring out the bill H. R. 9020, because it means so much to the veterans.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman would not be surprised if we could bring it up under suspension?

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Another point is that when these legislative bodies come down here concerning legislation they should invite our chairman to the committee meetings.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think they would benefit very much if

they would come and consult the entire committee that was created to handle the veterans' legislation. Many of the members of the committee are expert lawyers and experts on veterans' legislation. We have some of the ablest and smartest Members of the House of Representatives on that committee. People testifying before our committee have stated they thought that by and large it was the ablest Committee on Veterans' Affairs they had ever testified before.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. I agree with the gentlewoman. This committee has sat for hours taking testimony. When there is any kind of meeting of the various veterans' organizations I believe our chairman or some member of our committee should be invited. If not, we might just as well fold up as a committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There was a unanimous vote of the committee to that effect, I would say to the gentleman. With very great emphasis on the meeting of yesterday, they feel that everything that has to deal with our legislation should be taken up with the Veterans' Committee and not through other groups. I think there are some committees of the House that would be very glad to take over some of the legislation for the veterans; in fact, I know that to be the fact. They think it would be very nice to have the veterans' legislation go through their committees. We have to guard that zealously. There are six great departments that are run by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. He has a terrific job.

By the way, just at that point, if I may go on for a moment, in the independent offices appropriation bill which came from the other body, there was \$3,500,000 appropriated for the operation of regional offices. Mr. Higley, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, had made a mistake in his estimates and he could not consolidate the regional offices so he asked for \$8 million more. The other body granted it, but then when the conferees got together, they cut that by over \$4 million. The budget told me twice that they did not see how the Veterans' Administration could function with that cut. And the Committee on Appropriations were told, and this is not their fault originally because they allocated all the money that the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration asked for, but they were cut, and they did not have enough money to pay for the services of the medical section and the hospitals. So they are asking now for \$3 million supplemental. There was a million added in the other body for repairs on a hospital in Long Beach, Calif. I think those repairs are necessary. I visited there and I approve of that. But, certainly, the money for that should not have been cut, and certainly there should not have been any cuts for the Veterans' Administration. This year all the appropriations for the veterans have been cut.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to express the appreciation which, I am sure, many of us on both sides of the aisle feel toward the gentlewoman for her courageous fight in behalf of a just and reasonable cost-of-living increase for the veterans and their dependents and orphans of veterans under H. R. 9020. I think the great number of signatures, which have already been placed on this petition, is evidence of the feeling on the part of a great number of the Members of the House that this is a matter which should be voted upon and voted upon soon. I would like in this connection to ask the gentlewoman from Massachusetts a question: Has any reason been given to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for the refusal of the Committee on Rules to hold a hearing on this bill?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have not been given any valid reason, I am forced to admit. Frankly, I do not know whether it is the fault of the chairman of the committee because I think he is guided by the leadership of the House. But, in all fairness, I will say to the gentleman, in the past we have had a great deal of difficulty in securing rules on legislation when the gentleman's party, the Democratic administration, was in power and we have even had to stay in session late and to hold the Congress in session in order to secure the passage of our legislation. Unfortunately, our legislation in the past has always come late.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I understand one reason that has been advanced as an objection to this bill is on the point of economy, and on the ground that the budget cannot stand this kind of increase. Yet, is it not true that this increase represents only about one-fifteenth or one-sixteenth of the foreign aid appropriation which was voted just a week or two ago by the House of Representatives?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is very true. I voted for that appropriation even though I did not want to vote for it. But, I did vote for it because I thought if there was anything we could do to prevent another great war, and to prevent the spread of communism, I was willing to try it. It has been suggested here on the floor that the appropriations for the veterans be taken out of that appropriation.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I think it is appropriate to reemphasize and repeat for the record the fact that the total appropriations for all veterans' programs immediately after the war was about \$9 billion. They amounted to \$8,900,000,000. Each year they have been reduced, and last year it was about \$4 billion or about one-half of what it formerly was. The next fiscal year it will be \$3,800,000,000. So the appropriations for the veterans of this country, although the veterans have been increasing in number, have been drastically and substantially reduced. The amount of money being appropriated for all veterans' programs is much less than one-half of what it formerly was so this

modest cost-of-living increase, I think, is nothing that the Congress should be alarmed about.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That also brings to my mind the fact that the medical section of the Veterans' Administration is short of doctors and the Board of Appeals is short of doctors to rate the cases. That means slowness in the veterans having justice done in that way. Frankly, I do not see how any Administrator of the Veterans' Affairs can function with the investigators he has. I think Mr. Higley recently has been trying to function with the suggestions of a former telephone company man, who is an efficiency expert. That is why he is making some of his reductions. Various investigators go out from the General Accounting Office and from the Budget Office and they tell Mr. Higley to economize, and he tries to economize and he is short of money.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Does this legislation, H. R. 9020, have the support of all veteran organizations?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Oh, yes. It has the unanimous support of all veteran organizations, very enthusiastically given. They are here all the time talking with us about it. Also, I would remind the gentleman that there are 22 million veterans in the country today and only 5 million belong to any veteran organizations. I think it would be better if more belonged to the organizations, because they would have more strength. At this point I would like to commend National Commander Connell, of the American Legion, and Mr. Miles Kennedy, his legislative director, for their untiring efforts to secure the enactment of this legislation. But we represent not only the organized veterans but the great mass of veterans who do not belong to any organization.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I understand one of the prime planks of the various veteran organizations is the preservation of the integrity of our committee, which is the only committee in Congress which deals exclusively with veterans' matters.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Oh, that is absolutely correct. The Veterans' Committee was first formed in 1924. Before that veterans' legislation came from the various committees. In 1924 the Veterans' Affairs Committee was formed to handle veterans' legislation. I became a member of that committee in 1925, so I have watched the committee for a great many years.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I may say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that this legislation is bipartisan; but if it fails in its enactment, the criticism will not necessarily be bipartisan.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No. But may I say this: I think every one of us will be criticized, whether we be Republicans or Democrats. During the 20 years under a Democratic administration I have fought just as hard as I am fighting today to secure the passage of legislation. Many of us here have worked until 3 or 4 or 5 o'clock in the

morning, at night sessions, trying to secure the passage of bills. So while the leadership is Republican now, there is great responsibility on both sides of the aisle on veterans' legislation more than anything else, because without them we would not be free today, and we owe them a duty we can never hope to repay.

I do not know whether the veterans will punish Members for not voting for them, but certainly the feeling will be very bitter against Members who do not vote for them, and, I think, justifiably so. I believe the President would sign H. R. 9020. I have no reason to think he will not. I know he wants economy, but in my heart I feel very sure that the President would sign H. R. 9020. I do not think there is any doubt about that.

Mr. Speaker, today the chairman of the Subcommittee on Hospitals, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY], and his subcommittee heard Charles N. Collatos, commander of the department of Massachusetts, of the American Legion, on the necessity for maintaining the Cushing Hospital at Framingham; also Mr. Norman B. Hartnett, one of the select men of Framingham, Mass., appeared with a very fine statement, and Congressmen LANE and PHILBIN and DONOHUE appeared for their bills.

I introduced the bill H. R. 9646, which would authorize the retention of the Cushing General Hospital as a chronic disease hospital and a sort of veterans domiciliary. It is not important which bill goes through except that whatever bill goes through should provide for the treatment of chronic diseases and its use as a veterans domiciliary. It is greatly needed, and I am sure the Members, if they will read the testimony which I will insert in the RECORD, will be thoroughly sure of the necessity for such a hospital in Massachusetts.

We are committed to taking care of the veterans, to see that they are hospitalized rather than that they die in the streets; also that the mentally incompetent must be taken care of. We have had some suicides and murders because men have not been hospitalized in time or because they have been put out of hospitals due to a shortage of beds.

Under permission previously granted, I insert at this point the statement of Mr. Collatos:

STATEMENT BY CHARLES N. COLLATOS, COMMANDER, DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS, THE AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, THURSDAY, JULY 15, 1954

Madam Chairman and members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, as department commander of the American Legion for Massachusetts, I desire to express my thanks for the kind invitation extended me to appear before you on pending veterans legislation as it affects the veterans of Massachusetts and New England. We in Massachusetts are grateful to you members and your outstanding chairman for the fine effort you have put forth in behalf of our war veterans. To you, especially, Mrs. ROGERS, we are grateful for your past efforts in behalf of our New England veterans, and for introducing H. R. 9646, which we believe is very timely.

H. R. 9646 seeks to retain the former Cushing Veterans' Administration hospital as a center for domiciliary and chronic cases.

I would like to give you some of the past history of this fine hospital.

Cushing Hospital, which formerly operated as a 1,900-bed Army hospital with a large paraplegic center, was declared surplus and was taken over by the Veterans' Administration on October 1, 1946, with an authorized bed capacity of 1,100 beds. The VA took over the care of the paraplegic Army patients remaining. It operated the hospital with a 1,000-bed authorized capacity, and for years it operated at maximum capacity, having a daily patient census well in excess of 900 patients. It is interesting to note that while many of the former military hospitals taken over by the VA had difficulty in operating at maximum capacity due to staffing problems, Cushing hospital had an outstanding record. In reviewing the record of eight visitations by our national field service, we find that on the first visit, August 30, 1948, shortly after activation of this hospital, of 31 full-time physicians authorized, there were vacancies of only 2 physicians, but on the subsequent 7 visitations, extending through September 18, 1953, authorized positions for full-time physicians (up to 48) were filled and no vacancies present.

As regards the nursing situation, from the first visitation up to the eighth on September 18, 1953, there was not a single vacancy in the nursing service, with as high an authorization as 244, except that on the last visit, when the hospital was in process of closing, there was only 1 nurse vacancy. I doubt if there is a Veterans' Administration hospital in the country with a better record regarding availability of authorized personnel. Likewise, the hospital had as many as 59 consultants and 73 attending physicians, and ran a large resident physicians program, up to 65. I am mentioning these statistics in view of a complaint that in many areas the Veterans' Administration experienced difficulty in the recruitment of professional and other personnel. Here we have a constructed hospital, where there would be no difficulty in adequately staffing same, to take care of veterans who are unable to obtain needed hospitalization due to lack of adequate facilities.

With Massachusetts now operating 1 TB, 3 NP, and 1 general medical and surgical VA hospital, we find that large waiting lists of certified eligibles still exist in these hospitals. As of March 31, 1954, information from VA form 10-7371, the monthly report of eligible persons not yet admitted for VA hospitalization, shows the following in these Massachusetts VA hospitals:

Bedford, Mass., shows 477 psychotic and 91 other psychiatric, a total of 568.

Northampton, Mass., shows a waiting list of 240 psychiatric cases.

The new VA hospital at Brockton shows a certified waiting list of 67 psychotic, 27 other psychiatric, 8 tuberculosis, 3 medical, and 2 surgical cases, a total of 107.

The new general medical and surgical hospital at Boston shows a waiting list of 115 psychotic, 12 other psychiatric, 14 neurologic, and 2 surgical cases, a total of 143.

Thus, we see that 1,085 veterans with certified applications are awaiting admission to these four veterans' hospitals because beds are not available to them. This does not take into consideration the large numbers of veterans not included in this certified list of 1,085 who did not make formal application for admission after being advised of the difficulty in being hospitalized in the near future, nor does it include those veterans rejected for hospitalization because of chronic conditions with no adequate facilities for the care they need.

It would seem to me that we would be less than mindful of the welfare of our war disabled if the former Cushing VA hospital were released and not utilized by the Veterans' Administration, in the presence of demonstrated needs and in view of past experience that in the Cushing hospital staffing difficulties have not been experienced. Certainly we believe it to be wise economy to utilize this existing hospital rather than to plan for further new construction, if the Congress decides to take care of these needy and sick veterans. I would also desire to stress that Cushing VA hospital can also be utilized to take care of needs in nearby States where adequate facilities for sick veterans do not exist.

I also want to stress the large number of veterans on the certified waiting list with neuropsychiatric disabilities. Their chances of being admitted in the foreseeable future, I am advised, is remote.

I have been advised by competent medical source that many chronic psychiatric cases, now being hospitalized under locked-ward facilities at the other VA hospitals in Massachusetts, could be classified as nonsecurity mental cases and could be adequately cared for even on nonlocked wards in a place like Cushing. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (p. 5082, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senate, dated Apr. 14, 1954) shows that Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, brings out in a reproduced letter from a Framingham chapter of the Disabled American Veterans that the Governor of Massachusetts was planning to establish at the former Cushing VA hospital, if the State could obtain same "an institution for elderly mental patients not requiring close confinement." Certainly the VA could free much needed occupied beds in the other active NP services at existing VA mental hospitals for cases of this type and thus make available greatly needed beds for the more active mental cases on the present certified list of eligibles needing locked-ward care and close supervision. Also at Cushing there are adequate locked-ward facilities for the care of such cases found to need close confinement. Cushing at times took care of over 300 NP cases while a VA hospital, and when closed these were transferred to the new GMS hospital at Boston. Our field representative's report of February 19, 1953, shows that on that date the Boston VA hospital was taking care of 460 GMS cases and 235 NP patients. His report contains the following:

"This [Boston VA] hospital opened for patients on July 1, 1952. Since its opening, 6,400 patients have been treated and approximately 2,000 veterans seeking admission have been turned down for various reasons. On the day of dedication, July 27, 1952, there 498 patients, many being NP patients transferred from Cushing VA hospital and others from West Roxbury."

This is mentioned to show that Cushing has facilities even for the more serious mental cases.

I would like to mention that even with the opening of the new GMS hospital at Boston, there has been no actual gain in GMS beds for the Boston area. Cushing with its 1,000 operating beds was essentially a GMS hospital. West Roxbury, which had a 327-bed GMS capacity, in addition to a 55-bed NP unit, was converted as of November 1953 to 151 GMS beds and 153 paraplegic beds. Thus, we in Massachusetts sustained a 176 bed loss in GMS beds in addition to the losses in GMS beds occasioned by the closing of Cushing VA hospital and the opening of the new Boston GMS hospital. Also, this new GMS hospital at Boston has a constructed capacity of 940 beds, and as of February 28, 1954 had 792 of these beds occupied (including the NP unit there). Present VA plans based on budget estimates for fiscal year 1955 call for a 778 average daily bed occupancy as compared to an average daily bed occupancy of 774 from July 1953 to April 1954. Certainly this does not appear to be sufficient for the needs of the war disabled in Massachusetts.

One of the greatest shortages in the Veterans' Administration and the Nation as a whole is in the category of chronic disease.

The Annual Report of the Administrator of Veterans Affairs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952 states on page 9:

"For the most part, veteran patients constitute a closed and aging population, characterized by a greater frequency of multiple disabilities and chronic disorders less amenable to treatment, which require longer care."

Also, on page 17 of this report we find:

"Not less than 86.8 percent of the beds available in VA and non-VA hospitals (for VA care) were therefore required for tuberculosis, psychiatric, and neurological patients and for general medical and surgical patients whose disabilities were either service-connected, permanent and total, or long-term requiring hospitalization of more than 90 days, or whose hospitalization was clearly the responsibility of the Federal Government."

Further, a similar annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 states on page 14:

"However, the waiting list for neuropsychiatric cases has been increasing generally since 1945."

The same report on page 19 states:

"The comparison of the most frequent diagnostic conditions among discharged veterans with different periods of war service provides a guide for forecasting the future composition of the VA patient load."

These studies indicate the need of providing sorely needed facilities for certain aged and infirm mental patients as well as for chronic disease of all categories, which could very adequately be cared for if Cushing VA hospital is retained. The needs exist; the facilities do not.

In addition to being able to provide adequate facilities for providing care for chronic cases as described, Cushing hospital could very well serve the domiciliary needs of New England.

Domiciliary care is the provision of a home, with such incidental medical care as is needed, for eligible veterans suffering from a permanent disability who are incapacitated from earning a living and have no adequate means of support.

Prior to 1944 there appeared to be an adequate number of domiciliary beds as there was then in existence an 1,100-bed domiciliary at Togus, Maine. In 1944, due to the great demand for NP beds, this domiciliary unit was discontinued and converted into a neuropsychiatric hospital as it was felt that there was a greater need for the neuropsychiatric beds. Since 1944 New England has been without a VA domiciliary home. As there was need for 1,100 domiciliary beds at Togus, Maine prior to 1944, we are unable to understand why there is no need for domiciliary home beds in the New England area since then. We have been advised that since the closing of the domiciliary at Togus the Veterans Administration has been attempting to meet the domiciliary needs of the New England area by making available four domiciliary centers, namely, at Bath, N. Y. (the closest to New England); Dayton, Ohio; Martinsburg, W. Va.; and Kecoughtan, Va. It is further brought out that these 4 centers report that they are providing domiciliary care for only 244 veterans, listing residence in the New England States, with 154 of these at Bath, N. Y. It is quite evident that this small number of domiciliary residents from the New England area can be accounted for mainly by the distance involved in travel of these sick and needy veterans, and is no true criterion of the existing needs for domiciliary beds in the New England area.

Following the closing of the Togus domiciliary there was an increase in the number of State soldiers homes beds; but even these, we understand, were not adequate to meet the needs of our war disabled in New England. Apparently the Veterans' Administra-

tion is cognizant of this fact, that is, that the small number of New England veterans domiciled is due to distance from their residence. We have been advised that the need for accommodations at a point close to place of residence is considered "economically impractical as long as there are existing beds within a reasonable distance." We do not believe that the centers listed as serving the New England area constitute "reasonable distance" for those veterans "sick and broke" and with no one to take care of them. It appears that the Veterans' Administration has desired to take care of the domiciliary needs of the veterans of New England. It is reported that at one time they had under consideration the utilization of the former Cushing hospital for this purpose, but that in view of "lack of authority and funds" to operate it as a domiciliary facility, the VA declared it excess.

Again I want to stress that this action in declaring Cushing excess was not prompted by the lack of need but by lack of authority and funds to operate Cushing. It is our understanding also that the Bureau of the Budget's advice regarding the continuation of Cushing as a domiciliary has been unfavorable, apparently only on a basis of reduction of funds. It is my opinion that the amount of moneys involved here is not very great, and the amount of good derived in taking care of the chronic cases now on the waiting list and the domiciliary needs of the New England area will far outweigh the relatively small funds necessary to continue Cushing as proposed in H. R. 9646.

Again I wish to express my deep appreciation to the chairman and members of this committee for their courtesy in hearing this presentation, and their abiding interest in studying and proposing legislation beneficial to the veterans of this country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. VURSELL in two instances.

Mr. HYDE and to include a statement of Mr. HYDE, sent to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, with respect to H. R. 9137.

Mr. RODINO and to include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

Mr. WOLVERTON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in two instances and to include related matter.

Mr. BYRD.

Mr. BENDER.

Mr. CANNON.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1067. An act to authorize the Supreme Court of the United States to make and publish rules for procedure on review of decisions of The Tax Court of the United States;

H. R. 1673. An act for the relief of James I. Smith;

H. R. 5578. An act for the relief of Hatsuko Kuniyoshi Dillon;

H. R. 5731. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct facilities to provide water for irrigation, municipal, do-

mestic, military and other uses from the Santa Margarita River, Calif., and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7664. An act to provide for the development of the Priest Rapids site on the Columbia River, Wash., under a license issued pursuant to the Federal Power Act.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1276. An act to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, so as to provide for a variable interest rate, second mortgage security for loans under title I, and for other purposes; and

S. 3539. An act to further amend title II of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the computation of reenlistment bonuses for members of the uniformed services.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, July 19, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1735. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize permanent appointments in the United States Navy and in the United States Marine Corps"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1736. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1737. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession contract to Arthur F. and Marion J. Lange, doing business as the Trading Post, which will, when executed on behalf of the Government by the regional director, region No. 2, National Park Service, authorize them to operate a general store and gift shop, and soda fountain and lunch counter, in Grand Teton National Park, Wyo., for a period of 5 years from November 1, 1953, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1738. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Hans Kuzura"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1739. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 4421 of the Revised Statutes, in order to remove the requirement as to verifying under oath certain certificates of inspection, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1740. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department, contractors with the Post Office Department, mail clerks of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 9859. A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2247). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ARENDS: Committee on Armed Services. S. 22. An act to validate certain payments for accrued leave made to members of the Armed Forces who accepted discharges for the purpose of immediate reenlistment for an indefinite period; without amendment (Rept. No. 2249). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 3245. An act to provide emergency credit; with amendment (Rept. No. 2250). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 3697. An act to amend the act of April 6, 1937, as amended, to include cooperation with the Governments of Canada or Mexico or local Canadian or Mexican authorities for the control of incipient or emergency outbreak of insect pests or plant diseases; without amendment (Rept. No. 2251). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of California: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 7334. A bill to authorize certain property transactions in Coccol, C. Z., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2252). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 8897. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer 40 acres of land in the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, Mont., to School District No. 6, Rosebud County, Mont.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2253). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ARENDS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9302. A bill to permit retired members of the uniformed services to revoke elections made under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 in certain cases where the elections were made because of mathematical errors or misinformation; with amendment (Rept. No. 2254). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REAMS: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 9825. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to prohibit or regulate the use of Government property under his custody and control for the parking or storage of vehicles; without amendment (Rept. No. 2255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LeCOMPTÉ: Committee on House Administration. S. 1654. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a method of voting in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence," approved September 16, 1942, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7813. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to adjust or cancel certain charges on the Milk River project; with amendment (Rept.

No. 2258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 639. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 8896, a bill to amend the mineral leasing laws to provide for multiple mineral development of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2263). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 8932. A bill to reclassify dictaphones in the Tariff Act of 1930; with amendment (Rept. No. 2264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 9666. A bill to amend section 1001, paragraph 412, of the Tariff Act of 1930, with respect to hardboard; with amendment (Rept. No. 2265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ARENDS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9804. A bill to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2248). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4866. A bill for the relief of George S. Ridner; with amendment (Rept. No. 2256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Concurrent Resolution 254. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 2259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3869. A bill for the relief of Gilbert Elkanah Richards, Adelaide Gertrude Richards, and Anthony Gilbert Richards; with amendment (Rept. No. 2260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6762. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Irmgard (Chrapko) Broughman; with amendment (Rept. No. 2261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9671. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fa-chi Ling Wang and Eileen Wang; with amendment (Rept. No. 2262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VORYS:

H. R. 9910. A bill to amend section 413 (b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 9911. A bill to amend the United States Cotton Standards Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. R. 9912. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemora-

tion of the 75th anniversary of the first electrically lighted city in the world, Wabash, Ind.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 9913. A bill to convey by quitclaim deed certain land to the Brownsville Navigation District of Cameron County, Tex.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 9914. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Rosebud Sioux Tribe of the Rosebud Reservation in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 9915. A bill declaring the Communist Party and similar revolutionary organizations illegal; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 9916. A bill to amend section 5 (a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain unfair methods of competition in connection with the sale of manufactured products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 9917. A bill to amend section 5 (a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain unfair methods of competition in connection with the sale of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 9918. A bill to change the name of Gavins Point Reservoir back of Gavins Point Dam to Lewis and Clark Lake; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 9919. A bill to release and quitclaim all rights and interests of the United States in certain real property to Newport, Ark.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 9920. A bill to release and quitclaim all rights and interests of the United States in certain real property to Walnut Ridge, Ark.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 9921. A bill to amend section 709 of title 18, United States Code, so as to protect the name of the Federal Bureau of Investigation from commercial exploitation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 9922. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe regulations relating to qualifications of persons who assist taxpayers in the determination of the Federal tax liabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 9923. A bill to provide that the provisions of the Natural Gas Act shall not apply to the sale of natural gas, as an incident of its production and gathering, by an independent producer not engaged in the interstate transmission of natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 9924. A bill to provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 9925. A bill to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 9926. A bill to provide for the stockpiling of surplus agricultural commodities for civil defense purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 560. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Co-

lumbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the American Legion national convention of 1954, to authorize the granting of certain permits to the American Legion 1954 Convention Corp. on the occasion of such convention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. J. Res. 561. Joint resolution to authorize the quartering in public buildings in the District of Columbia of troops participating in activities related to the American Legion national convention of 1954; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'NEILL:
H. Con. Res. 255. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to the admission of Chinese Communists to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:
H. Res. 635. Resolution for extension of greetings to the Gold Coast and Nigeria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:
H. Res. 636. Resolution providing a code of fair procedure for the committees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRETELLA:
H. R. 9927. A bill for the relief of Luzie Biondo (Luzie M. Schmidt); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:
H. R. 9928. A bill for the relief of Dionisios Ravanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:
H. R. 9929. A bill for the relief of Vasilios Liakopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:
H. R. 9930. A bill for the relief of Vito Recchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:
H. R. 9931. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Henri Revilliod; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHUFORD:
H. R. 9932. A bill for the relief of the Dixie Novelty Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9933. A bill for the relief of Gerasimos Athanase Haberis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:
H. R. 9934. A bill for the relief of Rodrigo D. Brito Peres; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:
H. R. 9935. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emma Isabel Butler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:
H. Res. 637. Resolution providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 6242) for the relief of the West Coast Meat Co. of Hayward, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:
H. Res. 638. Resolution providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 5813) for the relief of Jacksonville Garment Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1101. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of William Swayze, Lapeer, Mich., and 86 others, relative to H. R. 1227, a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1102. Also, petition of Henry Levasseur, Mount Clemens, Mich., and 15 others requesting that H. R. 4596, a bill to grant a pension of \$100 per month to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I who are over 62 years of age, be enacted into law; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1103. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chairman, Hawaii Statehood Commission, Honolulu, T. H., relative to a special meeting held June 24, 1954, at Honolulu, that, with the profoundest respect and sorrow for the memory of its lost leader, Joseph R. Farrington, the Commission implore the United States Congress to quicken action on Hawaii's statehood bill; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1104. Also, petition of Daniel B. Maher, State of Maryland, relative to filing a petition for redress of grievance in behalf of Clyde L. Powell, who is a resident of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1105. Also, petition of the president, Public Power and Water Corp., Trenton, N. J., relative to an affidavit in support of motion and petition for impeachment, Public Power and Water Corp. against Hon. Herbert Brownell, Jr., Attorney General of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Let's Not Deceive Ourselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, the Red tide sweeps on in Asia while Western diplomacy continues to parry and obviously tries to compromise with the menace of Communist imperialism.

Having secured the rich Red River Delta under their belts, a prize awarded to them by voluntary French withdrawal, the Communists are now sweeping on toward Hanoi. It is not a pleasant thing, Mr. Speaker, to read of Americans and other civilians fleeing with an alacrity that suggests panic at Hanoi, and of course there are increasing signs that a Red fifth column awaits only the signal to spring into action inside the city.

Soon, we are told, the battle for Hanoi will begin. Judging by the resistance that has been offered thus far to the on-rushing Reds, this is not a very cheering prospect. The Communist offensive against this important city comes at a time when the French Government at home is at what appears to be a perpetual crisis, and the disposition of Western diplomacy seems to be to make

a gift of a large part of Vietnam to the Reds.

We might do well to pause and ponder what the recent French withdrawal from the Red Delta in Tonkin, Vietnam, meant. Without the firing of a shot, the Reds were handed a territory embracing some 1,600 square miles, and given control over some 2½ million of people. This region is a rich agricultural belt, but, more than this, the action handed over free peoples into Bamboo Curtain slavery—that is what it amounts to on a practical basis no matter how anyone tries to sugar-coat the bitter pill.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, a deal is being rigged right now at Geneva where "peace" for Indochina is being framed by "statesmen," statesmen who are bent on coexisting with communism and who will endeavor to legitimize this selling out of millions of souls to Red tyranny. Mr. Dulles has already been importuned to get back to Geneva so that the prestige of the United States may be utilized to give an air of respectability to this newest and latest sellout to communism.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, does any sensible, right-minded person believe for a second that anyone is going to be fooled by all the high-sounding platitudes that will be used to cover up this latest chapter of appeasement? Does anyone believe for a moment that the actions of Americans fleeing Hanoi will be lost on Asia's teeming millions as the West suf-

fers the loss of face once more? No. When the people of the world see what is going on at Hanoi, they will be wondering when it will be Saigon's turn, and how long it will be before Tokyo becomes the target for an all-out Communist drive.

That is the logical course of events, Mr. Speaker, in view of the West's soft policy toward Communist aggression. All of these objectives I have outlined are but station stops on the Communist drive for world conquest. What a pity it is that, in the face of such brutal evidence, statesmen of the West—men who should know the ways of aggression and especially the wiles of the Communist plunderer—continue to delude themselves that this way of abject appeasement is the road to peace. What monumental folly, Mr. Speaker. What moral blindness. What dangerous policy.

I wonder how many of our so-called Western "statesmen" stop to realize that in a world threatened by an atomic armament race the potentials of Asian resources far outstrip those of the Western World. Let us look to our maps, consult our geography, note the rich natural resources of Asia, and speculate upon the almost unlimited manpower of the East; then let us speculate, grimly, if you please, upon what will be the balance of power if, in our poverty of policy, we allow the Asian Continent to come wholly under Communist rule.

The first point in an intelligent, realistic approach to the global threat presented by Communist imperialism must be the realization that coexistence with communism can only be achieved upon Communist terms, and this represents victory for the Communists by default.

Secondly, no matter what the Communists pretend in the way of coexistence with the West, they do not themselves believe coexistence to be possible, for they are committed to the proposition that it is a matter of historical necessity that Marxism must eventually be triumphant over the West. So, when the Communists talk of coexistence they are merely using it as a pretext for a breather so as to gain time to digest their gains and get prepared for the next forward push.

Thirdly, in our diplomatic approach to the problem, we must realize that a political-moral chain reaction follows each and every single set of appeasement toward communism. An action in any one place in the world of public affairs is followed by political reaction everywhere else throughout the world. Japan, the bastion of the free world's defense in the East, is watching closely every development in Indochina. So, too, are Malaya, Burma, Indonesia, Thailand, and Pakistan and Iran—all of these states feel the political tremors as the Red storm breaks over Asia. Continued appeasement of Russian imperialism can only react to our ultimate sorrow.

Finally, we deceive ourselves at our own peril. We cannot embrace evil and hope to dwell in peace and security with it.

Mr. Speaker, I offer these suggestions for the West, and I commend them to the attention of Western diplomats in the hope that the free world may arouse itself from the torpor of delusion and the sweet gas of appeasement before it is too late. It is even now well beyond the 11th hour.

Tribute to William J. Jernick, Newly Elected Grand Exalted Ruler of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States of America is favored in many respects. But our order appears to be especially favored in the unimpeachable character and outstanding qualifications of the men who are willing to devote a year of their lives to serve as Grand Exalted Ruler. We were more than fortunate at the recent Los Angeles grand lodge session in the unanimous choice of William J. Jernick, of Nutley, N. J., as chief executive for the ensuing year.

It is not strange that the Order of Elks was attracted to such a man or that the order appealed to him as offering a wide field for useful endeavor. His election to grand exalted ruler climaxes Jernick's 20-some years of membership in the Elks. He joined Nutley Lodge in 1934, and 5 years later was its exalted ruler. Then in 1940, he became president of the New Jersey State Elks Association. He entered the grand lodge by appointment to the activities committee, of which he became chairman. Further grand lodge service included grand treasurer and grand trustee.

Eighty-six years have passed since a small group of inspired men took the virtues of charity, justice, brotherly love, and fidelity, and bound them into the organization of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks. The order has grown from the modest to the magnificent and has increased from a parlor group to 1,122,803 members.

Under Bill Jernick's inspiring guidance we may turn our faces to the future, knowing our splendid traditions will be upheld and that the order will expand its sphere of usefulness to mankind. The guidance we can expect is well illustrated in William Jernick's acceptance speech at Los Angeles. After urging Elks and all Americans to plan their thinking and living toward the preservation of our freedom against the threat of communism, Jernick stated:

If this world had more respect for divine guidance, it might have less need for guided missiles.

A charming wife and daughter—Mrs. Betty Duffy, of Honolulu—constitute the distaff side of the Jernick family. Two sons are Elks, Dr. Robert H. Jernick and William J. Jernick, Jr.

Bill Jernick is a resident and former mayor of Nutley, N. J. As an executive of the Thomas Edison Co. in Belleville, N. J., he is devoted to his work in the battery division as assistant vice president in charge of production. He has found time to give unselfishly to community interests and has established himself in the confidence and esteem of his fellow townsmen, as evidenced by the following editorial from the July 8, 1954, issue of the Nutley Sun:

PRIDE IN A GOOD NEIGHBOR

Nutley can but feel a warm glow of extreme pride in the election this week of former Mayor William J. Jernick to the office of grand exalted ruler of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks. His election is one of those one-in-a-million tributes because the Elks' membership now surpasses 1,125,000.

The national fraternal society recognized early in Jernick exactly the same qualities of integrity, honesty, endeavor, and ability which we, here in Nutley, recognized when time after time we elected him as our mayor. His record at the head of our town administration was outstanding and by his temperate leadership, his calm, fair, and fearless guidance of the town commission, he established our municipal government on a high standard of honest efficiency.

For the next year Bill Jernick will travel the land because one of the duties of his office is to visit as many lodges as possible. Wherever he goes, he can but add to the prestige of Nutley. It is with a great deal of pride and happiness that Nutley will join in a "welcome home, Bill" fiesta in the oval

on July 24 for his is a personality which makes only friends, no enemies. To all of us he is our good friend, our good neighbor.
R. E. H.

Red China Has No Right to Membership in the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, there is no basis of right or justice that entitles Red China to membership in the United Nations. On the contrary, there is every reason why it should not be admitted as a member.

The history of Red China has been one of war. Its hands are stained with blood. Its entrance into the Korean war prolonged hostilities and resulted in the unnecessary shedding of the blood of good American boys. Nearly 150,000 casualties in the ranks of our Army in Korea can be charged to it. And today Red China is giving aid and support to the fighting that is raging in Indochina. What a record on which to base a claim of right to admission to the United Nations, the fundamental purpose of which is to promote peace.

Even the most casual reading of the purposes of the United Nations destroys any right of Red China to membership in it. Observe the following taken from the charter of the United Nations:

Article 1 spells out the purposes for which the United Nations has been organized—

To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;

To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;

To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and

To be a center for harmonizing the actions of the nations in the attainment of these common ends.

Article 2 imposes rules of conduct upon the members:

The organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members.

All members, in order to insure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present charter.

All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

All members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present charter, and shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action.

Mr. Speaker, measured against the requirements laid down in the charter, the Chinese Communists do not meet the standards prescribed for membership in the United Nations. They have shown a consistent disregard for fundamental human rights, they have degraded the dignity of persons, and they have obliterated the rights of individuals. Freedom has been stifled; intolerance has been substituted for tolerance.

In the international field the Chinese Communists have not only refused to assist the United Nations in its action taken in accordance with the charter against aggression in Korea; they have participated in the aggression. This is not alone the judgment of the United States. It is the considered conclusion reached by an overwhelming majority of the General Assembly. A regime that has been held to have violated the charter cannot plead that it meets the standards necessary to hold a seat in an organization pledged to support that very charter. Indeed to seat the Chinese Communists would only qualify them for expulsion. Article 6 states that—

A member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present charter may be expelled from the organization.

To accord representation to a regime that is unable or unwilling to discharge its international responsibilities would make a mockery of the very principles that led to the creation of the United Nations. It would violate both the letter and the spirit of the charter.

The moral and legal issues involved in this question are not in conflict with the practical issues. The United States and the United Nations are engaged in hostilities against the Chinese Communists. To give them a permanent seat on the Security Council equal in weight to that of the United States and the other permanent members, would enhance their prestige, give courage to their sympathizers, and weaken those who are resisting Communist aggression from without and Communist subjugation from within. It would imply an acceptance of their permanent conquest of China and give them an air of respectability. All of this is in contradiction to the judgement already expressed by the members.

The consequences of seating the Chinese Communists would be disastrous. It would be a reward to the enemies of the United Nations and of the United States. The prestige of the organization would suffer irreparably no less than that of the members who are fighting to uphold its principles.

The United States has vigorously opposed efforts to seat the Chinese Communists in the United Nations at each

of the approximately 150 times that this question has been raised since 1950.

The administration under President Eisenhower has been alert at all times to the danger inherent in admitting Communist China into the United Nations. On July 7, of the present year, President Eisenhower in answer to questions addressed to him at his press conference replied in a manner to leave no doubt of his unqualified opposition. He said:

I am completely and unalterably opposed under the present situation to the admission of Red China into the U. N. I personally think that 95 percent of the population of the United States would take the same stand. Now let's take a look at this thing for a minute, if you will bear with me. There is a moral question, first of all, that is involved. The United Nations was not established primarily as a supergovernment clothed with all of the authority of a supergovernment and of great power to do things. It was, among other things, an attempt to marshal the moral strength of the world in order to preserve peace, to make certain that quarrels were composed through a decent respect for justice and fairness and right, and to see whether we couldn't avoid resort to force. Now, today we have Red China going to Geneva and instead of taking a conciliatory attitude toward anything, it excoriated the United Nations. As a matter of fact, in Geneva it demanded repudiation of the United Nations position. On top of that, Red China is today at war with the United Nations. They were declared an aggressor by the United Nations in the Assembly. That situation has never been changed. They are occupying North Korea; they have supported this great effort at further enslavement of the peoples in Indochina; they have held certain of our prisoners unjustifiably and they have been guilty of the employment of the worst possible diplomatic deportment in the international affairs of the world. Now, how can the United States as a self-respecting nation, doing its best and in conformity with the moral standards as we understand them, how can we possibly say this country should be admitted or this government should be admitted to the U. N.? That is the way the case stands now, and that is my position.

We went into the United Nations under treaty forms. Now, I must say first, if the United States ever reaches the point that it wants to repudiate solemn treaty obligations it must do so after the most careful deliberation and study of all of the consequences that could be involved. Secondly, I repeat, the establishment of the United Nations was an effort to rally the moral forces of the world. I don't see how in all conscience the United Nations—I don't see how any state, impartial state, can vote for their acceptance under present conditions—I don't understand it.

This firm statement by the President as well as others by the Secretary of State and by Members of both Houses of Congress appear to have borne fruit. Within the past few days one of our major allies that seemed to be giving strong support to Communist Chinese representation in the United Nations has advocated a more cautious and realistic approach.

To further substantiate the strong position that has been taken by our Government, I draw attention to the letter of Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State, dated July 8, 1954, addressed to Hon. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, chairman of the Committee on Foreign

Affairs of the House of Representatives, in which he sets forth the policy of the United States Government. It reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 8, 1954.

The Honorable ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHIPERFIELD: Pursuant to our telephone conversation of July 7, the Department of State submits the following comments on House Joint Resolution 286 which provides that if the Communist regime of China "should be admitted to the United Nations or any of the specialized agencies referred to in article 57 of the United Nations Charter, the United States Government should reexamine its policy regarding the United Nations or the specialized agency, as the case may be, and its membership therein."

This Government firmly opposes the seating of representatives of the Chinese Communist regime in the United Nations and the specialized agencies. The President reaffirmed this policy as recently as July 7. United States representatives in meetings of the United Nations and the specialized agencies are actively carrying out this policy. They will continue to do so. In addition, the considered and firm policy of this Government has been made clear to other friendly governments beyond the possibility of any misunderstanding, and we will continue to reiterate our views whenever required. We believe that this course of action offers the best prospect for the continued achievement of our basic policy objective.

If representatives of the Chinese Communist regime should be seated in the United Nations or any of the specialized agencies, it is axiomatic that we would reexamine our policy regarding the organization concerned, in the light of the circumstances then existing. However, we would not think that the policy we have in mind would be promoted by any congressional action which seemed to take it for granted that the Chinese Communist regime would in fact be seated in the various organs of the United Nations.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

I am in full accord with the attitude our Government has taken in its opposition to Communist China. I shall vote in favor of the resolution—House Resolution 627—now under consideration by the House and which reads as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives reiterates its opposition to the seating of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the United Nations or any of its specialized agencies and supports the President in his expressed determination to use all means to prevent such representation.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, can anybody tell us what "peaceful coexistence" means to Moscow?

Public Laws 404 to 423, Inclusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the reports to my constituents covering Public Laws 404 to 423, inclusive, as follows:

THIRTY-FIRST REPORT ON LEGISLATION OF THE 83D CONGRESS

DEAR FRIEND: As the 83d Congress continues the drive toward an expected adjournment around month-end the number of House Members who have answered all roll-calls (including quorum calls) has been reduced from 9 (of 435) at the close of the first session to 4 at the present time. I am happy that good fortune has permitted your Representative to remain on the list. I thought you would wish it that way.

The number who have answered all calls in the 1953-54 sessions, I am told, is the lowest in the modern history of the Congress, due among other good and valid reasons to the President's congressional luncheons and the trips to Nevada to witness atomic explosions. Important committee assignments at home and abroad necessarily caused others to miss some rollcalls.

Beginning where we left off, here are the new laws of the land:

PUBLIC LAW 404

S. 2761, irrigation costs: This is legislation to take care of hardship cases in connection with the Hermiston and West Extension irrigation districts in Oregon. I found the facts interesting; I think you will.

Operation of the Hermiston unit started in 1908. Total repayments on the \$2,573,000 cost have been little more than \$300,000. The west extension unit was opened in 1917. Cost was \$1,137,000; repayments have totaled \$86,000. Reason: because of soil conditions, lands reverted to their original condition, covered with sagebrush and greasewood; farmers just could not raise crops to meet required repayments.

Public Law 404, similar to other laws in like situations, adjusts scale of repayments to gear with land productivity. The original act provided for an amortization period of 40 years, later extended to 50 years. Public Law 404 further extends the period to 163 years. At the end of that period slightly less than half a million dollars additional repayments will have been made on both projects, leaving Uncle Sam to hold the bag for close to \$3 million. Proving, I would say, that all the millions that go into irrigation do not come out in fertile acres.

The overall record of repayments on irrigation projects in the 17 States where located is reported as good. Some have returned to the Federal Government 100 cents on the dollar, others have gone almost completely sour. This of interest to you since you contribute to the Federal tax dollars that foot the bill when miscalculations and overzeal in the planning result in later busts.

Also you will take local interest and pride that under the direction of Gordon Clapp, M. A. (University of Chicago) in the case of TVA not only has the repayment schedule been met, but payments are far in advance of a schedule requiring complete repayment in 40 years. Furthermore, TVA is returning a 4- to 5-percent yield on the money invested by the Federal Government. That University of Chicago's M. A. in this instance means "money ahead" for Uncle Sam and you, his taxpaying nieces and nephews.

PUBLIC LAW 405

S. 2773, mail distribution from motor vehicles: Envisioned in this law is a future with a post office on motor wheels driving up to your doorstep with your morning mail. At present there are 133 highway post offices distributing mail en route in rural short-haul areas. But existing law prohibited their operation where adequate railroad facilities were available. Public Law 405 leaves it to the discretion of the Postmaster General. Immediate expansion of the motor-vehicle service is in prospect, at first in substitution of branch-line railroads which either have gone out of existence or have greatly reduced train service. If it works, the post office on wheels in big cities like Chicago is among the possibilities.

The railway postal clerks and other postal workers are watching the development with some apprehension. I was present at a meeting of railway postal clerks in Chicago when an accredited representative of the Postmaster General stated it was the thought of his department ultimately to use the railroads only in long-haul operations, otherwise motors and aircraft. The railway postal clerks have rendered a long and honorable service to the Government. It is only fair that in any innovations in the name of progress, economy, and efficiency due respect be shown their right in seniority.

In voting for Public Law 405 it was on the assurance that its administration in the limited area planned would not be permitted to trespass upon the rights of present postal workers.

PUBLIC LAW 406

S. 3090, Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande: Falcon Dam, 75 miles from Laredo, Tex., is a joint multiple-purpose project of the United States and Mexico. It was completed in 1953. This year when devastating floods destroyed 1,500 homes and did vast damage around Laredo the huge reservoir of the dam (storing flood waters for future dry seasons) completely protected the area south of Laredo on both sides of the border.

The project includes one power plant. Two additional plants, one on the American side, one on the Mexican, are near completion. Cost: \$47 million, divided equally between the two Governments. The power plants, interconnected, will generate 250 kilowatt-hours annually, subject to equal division.

Public Law 406 provides for the transmission and disposition (under the Secretary of the Interior) of our share of this power. Rate schedules will cover cost of production and amortization of Uncle Sam's investment. Protection against a grab by a private company is in this provision: "Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives."

Here is a strengthening illustration of how two governments can work together in a joint adventure contributing to the economic development of both countries and in the end realizing the full return of invested capital.

PUBLIC LAW 407

S. 3524, temporary appointments in Navy: During the Korean emergency title III of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 relating to the advancement of junior naval officers was suspended. Now the Navy plans to go back to that act. Public Law 407 clears the way by classifying some 17,750 naval officers promoted since June 30, 1951, under another act as having been promoted under title III. Passed by consent.

PUBLIC LAW 408

S. 3446, West Point: This authorizes the needed rehabilitation of two barracks at the West Point Academy.

PUBLIC LAW 409

H. R. 107, Fort Buford, N. Dak.: By reason of this legislation the North Dakota State Historical Society will take over part of the

site of Fort Buford (trading post in 1774) to restore it to the likeness of old days when troops rode from its enclosure to do battle with hostile redskins. Its proposed restoration follows a popular nationwide trend resulting from auto touring and the love of Americans to visit spots of interest in our national history.

THIRTY-SECOND REPORT ON LEGISLATION OF THE 83D CONGRESS

DEAR FRIEND: Continuing where we left off, here are the new laws of the land:

PUBLIC LAW 410

H. R. 2226, naval civilian employees: This repeals an old law (1902) under which civilian employees of the Navy serving overseas were paid salaries from date of vessel's departure from and arrival at United States ports. Hereafter they will be paid as all other Government overseas employees, from date of leaving their actual homes and arrival at work sites, and vice versa on return. Passed by consent.

PUBLIC LAW 411

H. R. 8497, census of manufactures: This is a good illustration of how the first session of the 83d Congress (1953) made a false showing of economy.

By law a census of manufactures, minerals, and other businesses is required every 5 years after 1949. That made one due in 1954. But the Congress, to make a paper showing of economy, failed to include it in the appropriations for 1953, when the work had to be done.

Public Law 411 authorizes the extension of the time for the census from 1954 to 1955. Result: the money saved one year will be spent the next.

PUBLIC LAW 412

H. R. 6328, Hawaii: Hawaiian Organic Act prohibits any exchange of public lands exceeding 40 acres in area or \$5,000 in value. So when the Territory [to encourage citizen farmers and to consolidate its own holdings] wished to swap 288 acres of public lands near Waimea for Citizen Smart's 308 acres, Public Law 412 (authorizing the trade) was necessary.

PUBLIC LAW 413

H. R. 2849, Hawaii: In 1936 the Federal Government gave to the Territorial government of Hawaii some 9 acres at Kahului exclusively for use as a public park. No residences nearby, there is no demand for a park. But business of the port has boomed and there is presently a demand for additional storage and shedded area for increased shipping. Public Law 413 makes the 9 acres available for that purpose by removing the park restriction.

PUBLIC LAW 414

H. R. 5913, second-class mail matter: This simplifies the handling of postage on newspapers and periodicals by repealing an obsolete law (39 U. S. C. 286) requiring the manual affixing of stamps. It will save work and expense for both the postal service and the publishers.

PUBLIC LAW 415

H. R. 5831, Hawaii: Territorial Legislature of Hawaii petitioned the Congress for this legislation authorizing the Hawaiian Homes Commission to exchange lands under its control for other public lands of equal value. The Commission makes homesteads available to native Hawaiians up to 5,000 acres a year.

PUBLIC LAW 416

H. R. 5833, Hawaii: Another law for the Hawaiians. It authorizes the exchange of public lands for private lands needed as the sites for new public schools.

PUBLIC LAW 417

H. R. 6888, Hawaii: Still another Hawaiian measure. This provides for the lease to native Hawaiians of irrigated pastoral lands in lots of from 40 to 100 acres.

PUBLIC LAW 418

H. R. 6800. Hawaii again: When the Legislature of Hawaii extended an electric light and power franchise on the island of Kauai it had to come to the Congress (under the organic act) for approval. Public Law 418 O. K.'s the act of the legislature.

PUBLIC LAW 419

H. R. 8092. Philippines: Under Public Law 419 nationals of the Republic of the Philippines coming to the United States as traders and investors will be issued nonimmigrant visas on the basis of a reciprocal agreement granting similar privileges to our nationals.

PUBLIC LAW 420

H. R. 6655, education of the deaf: Columbia Institution for the Deaf was incorporated by Congress in 1857. It consists of Gallaudet College, the only college in the world exclusively for deaf students, and Kendall School, an elementary and secondary school for the deaf. Although not a Federal instrumentality, it largely is supported by Federal appropriations and by law 1 Member of the Senate, 2 of the House serve on its board of directors.

Public Law 420 changes the name to Gallaudet College (after Rev. Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet, 1787-1851, a clergyman who established the first school for the deaf in America). It also provides a new charter under which the board of directors will have full authority in curriculum and other matters similar to that usually exercised by the boards of private and State universities. The objective is to make Gallaudet College adequate to give the advantages of higher education to applicants from all sections of the country who have no other place to receive college training. With new facilities and improved teaching personnel, as planned, the college is expected to have a standing sufficiently high to become accredited.

This is the character of legislation I especially am happy in supporting with the vote you have delegated me to cast for you.

PUBLIC LAW 421

H. R. 8044, Philippines—hospitalization of veterans: Part of the expense of taking care of hospitalized veterans of the Philippine Army who served with the Armed Forces of the United States in World War II is borne by the United States. A hospital, now under construction, was made possible by a \$22,500,000 grant from our Government. Public Law 865 of the 80th Congress (1947-48) authorized an annual appropriation of \$3,285,000 to aid the Philippine Government in the care of the veterans. Public Law 421 of this Congress, passed by the House by consent, extends this authorization another 5 years.

PUBLIC LAW 422

S. 1794, care of demented Indians: This authorizes the payment to the South Dakota State Hospital for the Insane of \$8,124 for care of demented Indian patients. Through inadvertence authority for hospitalization had not been cleared previously through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, as required, hence the necessity for another law. Passed by consent.

PUBLIC LAW 423

S. 2654, stone quarry in District of Columbia: In 1898 the District of Columbia purchased 17 acres in nearby Maryland for a stone quarry. It has been abandoned for years. Public Law 423 gives the District Commissioners the go-ahead in selling it at public auction to the highest bidder. It required a law of Congress.

Cordially and sincerely,

BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress.

Echo Park Dam—Too Much Heat and Not Enough Light

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it is often said that a little knowledge is a dangerous thing. I know this is true in the field of medicine—it must be true in other problems facing Congress.

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, of which I am chairman, is often bombarded with the pros and cons of arguments on many subjects that seem to carry more heat than light. Emotions are easily aroused whenever you discuss the subject of conservation.

I have always been a firm believer in the fact that if the people know the truth, they seldom make a mistake. I believe knowing the truth will make you free. In that spirit I submit certain questions and answers that have been frequently asked on the subject of the Echo Park Dam in the upper Colorado River Basin. As chairman of the committee which is handling this legislation, I have tried to maintain a constructive and objective view of this problem.

I have been convinced of one thing—water is the lifeblood of many communities. With no water, there can be no development of industry or population. I am also convinced that one of the biggest wastes of the resources in this country is the permitting of water to run to the ocean without first being used over and over for power, irrigation, and domestic or industrial use. Communities live or die, grow or remain the same because they either have plenty of water or not enough water.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced it is time for Members of Congress to talk about the new wealth coming from irrigation projects and the proper use of water instead of how much the projects cost. Water put upon thirsty land produces new wealth, new industry, and, of course, new taxes to help Uncle Sam meet the needs of a growing, dynamic country.

Very few quarrel over the many billions of dollars which are spent for flood control, river and harbor navigation, and agriculture conservation programs. What does it cost Uncle Sam—nearly \$7½ billion. This is more than 4 times the amount spent on irrigation and reclamation during the past 50 years. The total cost of navigation and conservation programs is also a sizable amount.

I might remind my colleagues that not 1 cent of this money is returned to the Federal Treasury. However, Federal money invested in irrigation and reclamation is returned to the Treasury. Federal money invested to generate power as incidental to irrigation is returned to the Treasury with interest.

I do not oppose appropriating money for flood control, conservation, and navigation, for they, like irrigation and

reclamation, are a vital program of keeping our country strong and prosperous.

Those who fail to interpret the new jobs, the new homes, and the new wealth which comes from irrigation and reclamation are destitute of imagination. Rather than seeing our country grow and prosper, they would prefer to see it remain the same.

The Upper Colorado River Basin is one of the last major reclamation projects which remains undeveloped. It has been found to be economically feasible and the power and water to be made available by its development is critically needed throughout the entire area.

Now, as to the questions on the Echo Park Dam:

1. Question. Will the Echo Park Dam destroy or flood the Dinosaur National Monument?

Answer. No. The Echo Park Reservoir will occupy only 9 percent of the monument area, and this is confined to the bottoms of the canyons that are 3,000 feet deep. Thus, even at the dam site, inspirational values remain relatively unimpaired. The total effect is not to destroy inspirational values since there are literally hundreds of miles of deep colorful canyons remaining in the Colorado River country.

2. Question. Do the dams "invade" the monument and violate national park rights?

Answer. No; the Dinosaur National Monument was enlarged to include the Green and Yampa Rivers in 1938. Two years earlier in 1936, Park Service officials promised residents of the area, both in Utah and Colorado, that the enlargement of the Monument would not interfere with the development of power and water projects in the river canyons. Good faith requires that these promises be kept.

3. Question. Will the construction of proposed dams in Dinosaur National Monument doom wilderness areas in America to extinction?

Answer. In its present State only about 3 percent of Dinosaur National Monument is accessible to the general public. The remaining 97 percent is unseen and unknown to the traveling public as a whole.

Construction of the proposed dams, with their resultant lakes and safe waterways, will make the major features of the monument accessible to the public and still preserve large areas as untouched wilderness.

After construction of both Split Mountain and Echo Park Dams only 11 percent of the monument area will be inundated, leaving 8 percent in its present native state.

In the more than 150 national parks and monument areas of the United States are preserved wilderness regions nearly as large as the State of Maine. Canadian national parks preserve an area larger than Scotland or nearly 30,000 miles. The national forests of the United States preserve nearly 20 million acres of wilderness. State parks preserve additional thousands of acres. Besides all these vast wilderness regions, hundreds of thousands of square miles of untamed nature "run wild" outside these restricted areas.

Pioneers have struggled and died to tame a small percentage of this boundless area in order that the frontiers of civilization might be advanced. A few needed dams should not be looked upon as a national calamity. They are a means of securing hard won frontiers and pave the way for expanding populations. They provide the means for meeting acute human needs of these expanding populations.

4. Question. Is it true that the Dinosaur National Monument belongs to all the people of the United States, and, that, therefore, it cannot be used?

Answer. No. Admittedly, under its status as a national monument, it does belong to

citizens of the United States. However, opponents of Echo Park Dam derive from this the absurd notion that it may not be used by local families thirsting for its waters in a desert area. Use of the monument for water-storage purposes was definitely promised at the time of its enlargement. Faith in and reliance on this promise has been demonstrated by (1) uncontested water filings involving dams near the Split Mountain and Echo Park damsites made in 1939 after the monument enlargement; (2) permission granted to the Bureau of Reclamation engineers to make surveys and core drillings of the damsites within the monument; (3) testimony of local Utah and Colorado citizens before the Secretary of Interior in 1950 and at hearings before Committees of Congress early in 1954; and (4) letters, testimony and expressions of high officials of the Department of Interior of both the previous and present administrations.

This moral commitment to the people must be kept.

5. Question. Will the Echo Park Dam cost the taxpayers money?

Answer. No. Funds used to build the dams are good investments by the Federal Government. All costs of Echo Park Dam are repayable together with interest on the power investment. Power revenues will also aid in paying for irrigation features of participating projects, after which millions of dollars per year will flow into the General Treasury of the United States.

6. Question. Do these dams mean Federal control and violate the principles of private enterprise?

Answer. No. On the contrary, the dams will encourage private enterprise by providing water and power for agriculture, municipal, and industrial use. Representatives of both private and public enterprise heartily support them.

7. Question. Will boating, now enjoyed by the general public, be destroyed?

Answer. No. The risky, rapids-shooting now possible on some stretches of the river is expensive and dangerous, and, is, therefore, not available to the general public. After completion of Echo Park Dam, a beautiful still-water reservoir for safe and economical boating will be enjoyed by great numbers of people instead of by just a select few.

8. Question. Why should Echo Park Dam be constructed?

Answer. Because—

(a) It is so located as to capture the waters of two rivers, the Yampa and the Green.
(b) It is needed to fulfill interstate compact obligations.

(c) It reduces water losses to a minimum.
(d) It is more efficient than any proposed alternatives.

(e) It will open up and stimulate the development of a vast recreational area now virtually closed to the general public.

9. Question. Are alternate damsites outside the monument just as good?

Answer. No. Many years of investigations by competent engineers have shown that there are no alternate sites or combination of sites that will provide the necessary river regulation, low cost power within reach of upper basin load centers, and a minimum of water loss by evaporation. "Alternate sites" being proposed are not substitutes for Echo Park because they, themselves, are integral parts of the overall plan of development of the basin and will be needed in addition to Echo Park in due course.

10. Question. Are increased losses of water by evaporation from proposed alternative reservoirs of little consequence as claimed by opponents to Echo Park Dam?

Answer. Any losses of water that can be prevented are of great consequence in an area which never will have a sufficient supply to adequately develop its natural resources. Even the most rabid opponents of Echo Park Dam admit that their proposed alternatives

involve an increased loss of water sufficient to care for the acute domestic water needs of 200,000 people. Are these people of little consequence?

11. Question. Will the lower Colorado Basin States and California be hurt by the building of the Echo Park Dam?

Answer. No. Holding the excess waters back during a rainy season should make more water available instead of less. There is a contract to supply 75 million acre-feet of water over a 10-year period at Parker Dam. Holding back this extra water will make this possible.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the building of this dam will attract many thousands of people instead of a few hundred. Roads will be built to make the place accessible. We, who have visited the Hoover Dam area, realize there would be no attraction now unless the dam had been built to hold the water back and make it more accessible to the millions who may now enjoy this area.

There are hundreds of canyons in the Rocky Mountain region which are unexplored that nature lovers can still enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is in the interest of our America of tomorrow to develop such areas as the Echo Park Dam. A growing country must not falter in developing and preserving for future generations the assets that it possesses.

To Assist Local Communities in Building Modern Industrial Plants in Labor-Surplus Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWITT S. HYDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I sent to the chairman of the Public Works Committee with respect to H. R. 9137, a bill to authorize Federal loans to assist local communities in building modern industrial plants in labor-surplus areas.

The statement follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 2, 1954.
Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Chairman, Public Works Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: May I take this opportunity to request action on H. R. 9137, a bill to authorize Federal loans to assist local communities in building modern industrial plants in labor-surplus areas.

I have a labor-surplus area in my congressional district, namely Allegany County. This community has been listed as a distress area for some time and is urgently in need of new industry. There is a large surplus of highly skilled labor in this community which can and should be utilized by some progressive industry.

It has been my experience that in a community the size of Cumberland, Md., the procurement of sufficient capital to provide the required facilities is a major obstacle in attracting new industries. I believe that this bill offers an excellent solution in over-

coming this financial obstacle. We know that when hardship areas such as Cumberland are given a boost, they react to the benefit of other areas; hence, there should be no objection to the bill.

The only change we suggest in the bill is a provision to insure that proper recognition be given the local industrial development groups without any Federal interference of appointment. I think it should also be made clear in the bill that a new industry would not have to be located within the city limits of the city which is recognized as eligible for assistance, but that such a new development could be located at least within a reasonable radius of the city limits.

I shall appreciate it if the Public Works Committee could consider this bill as promptly as possible. With kind regards, I am

Sincerely,

DEWITT S. HYDE.

Notice of Further Consideration by Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of Health Reinsurance Plan of President Eisenhower—It Is Not Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced from the response that has come from all over the Nation that the people are back of President Eisenhower's demand, that Congress provide a health plan of insurance that will enable the people to obtain adequate insurance, both as to coverage and rates, and that will enable them to meet the high cost of present day medical and hospital care.

The President's plan had a setback in the House on Tuesday of this week. I agree with the President that it was only a temporary delay. The bill is a well considered and carefully worked out plan. It has no element of socialized medicine in it. It is simply a plan to encourage insurance companies to expand the coverage of their present policies by including long-term illnesses, such as cancer, heart disease, tuberculosis, and other diseases as against which there are no available policies issued at this time by any insurance companies. Health insurance of this kind will help families to carry the terrific costs that must be met in these so-called long-term illnesses. The costs are so burdensome today, even as to the ordinary illness as distinct from long-term illness, that it wrecks the financial structure of the average family.

This bill is entirely voluntary in character. There is no element of compulsion, hence in no way socialistic in character. It does not even have within it anything that would tend to, or lead to, socialized medicine.

It is purely and simply an insurance bill. It is drawn along lines of good insurance principles. It has the endorsement of many of the outstanding insurance executives of the Nation who

met in consultation with President Eisenhower, and, likewise, it has the support of the most substantial insurance companies in the country.

The opposition of the American Medical Association to the bill was without any justifiable basis whatsoever. In fact, it had the support of some of the most outstanding and forward looking physicians in the Nation. It in no way was detrimental to the best interests of any practicing physician. In fact it would be of vast help to their profession. The insurance policy would provide funds from which physicians' fees and hospital and other medical charges would be paid. Wherein does this interfere either with rights of the physician or the right of patients to have a free choice of physician? Instead of a detriment it would be a great benefit to the physician. It is for these reasons, namely, absence of any form of compulsion, and an assurance that money would be available to pay fees and carry the usual medical costs, that physicians who have studied the plan are in favor of it. The only physicians who indicated opposition are those who have not read the bill, or who have been willing to follow blindly the unfounded, untruthful, and deceptive propaganda that has been put out by selfish interests who are opposed for other than justifiable reasons.

It is time that the members of the American Medical Association took a look at the proposed legislation which is a part of President Eisenhower's health program—a program that has been and is being worked out with the greatest care by the efficient and capable Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Oveta Culp Hobby.

The American Medical Association that comprises 140,000 out of 220,000 physicians throughout the Nation is a fine and worthwhile organization with ethics of a high order. For this reason it should not permit a few executives at the top to assume to speak for the rank and file of the membership. It has been evident to me many times, and, in many ways by personal conversation with practicing physicians, and otherwise, that the pronouncements and propaganda in the name of AMA did not represent the views of the great body of fine physicians, members of the organization and otherwise, who have in the past and will continue to render in the future noteworthy and beneficial service to our people. The opposition of AMA to anything and everything that has been proposed by way of additional facilities and otherwise, for the health benefits of our people, is not in accord with the progressive spirit that has driven the medical fraternity to greater and greater heights and achievements. It is time that physicians study for themselves the plans and programs of this administration to improve the health and welfare of our people. This administration and each of us who are a part of it are keenly aware of the need that exists today, and, we are determined to prevent socialized medicine even getting a foothold, and, furthermore, we believe we can meet and solve the existing need in a truly American way that recognizes the American prin-

ciple of free enterprise and freedom of choice—reinsurance health.

The bill which the American Medical Association through its executive officers has opposed does nothing more than recognize and make effective in the field of medicine the same principle that underlies the Federal Deposit Insurance law that guarantees bank deposits, the law that guarantees loans of Federal Housing and the many other similar laws. It is a well recognized and established principle not only in Government, but, also in the everyday transactions in commercial and industrial activities. All such have worked satisfactorily. So would the President's reinsurance bill, designed to encourage the writing of health policies that will cover the ills of mankind and help our people meet the staggering cost incident to illness.

Yesterday, July 14, 1954, President Eisenhower expressed, at his press conference, his views on the subject of his Reinsurance Health Plan. He left no doubt of his conviction that it is a good law and that he will continue his fight for its enactment, notwithstanding the temporary setback that it had in the House of Representatives on last Tuesday.

I include the remarks that President Eisenhower made on the above occasion. They are as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, in the campaign I made two promises that have to do with the health of the American people. I said, first, that I was opposed to socialized medicine and would use every single attribute and influence of the Presidential office to defeat any move toward socialized medicine.

I also said in talking about the great deficiencies in medical care in this country and particularly for people who can't afford the expensive type of service that is now available to us in our best hospitals, that something must be done.

We were going to study ways and means to bring better medical care to the rural areas and bring good and fine medical care within reach of the average household budget. This is what we have been trying to do.

I am sure that the people that voted against this bill just don't understand what are the facts of American life.

I don't consider that anyone lost yesterday except the American people. There is nothing to be gained, as I see it, by shutting our eyes to the fact that all of our people are not getting the kind of medical care to which they are entitled.

I do not believe there is any use in shutting our eyes to the fact that American people are going to get that medical care in some form or other. As I say, I am the last one to believe that the answer lies in socialized medicine, and I am trying to provide a plan. If they want to amend the plan or to perfect it in some way, to go ahead; but when the opponents of the plan get up in the House and say that this is only an effort of the Republicans to redeem our campaign promise, I plead guilty.

Of course I am trying to redeem my campaign promises, and I will never cease trying. This is only a temporary defeat. This thing will be carried forward as long as I am in this office.

It is the duty of everyone, Members of Congress, and individual citizens also, to support this noble effort of our President to improve the health of the Nation, and make possible the means that will enable our people to carry the cost of illness in a less burdensome way than now prevails.

To the end that the bill shall have continued and further attention it is my intention to bring it again before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House on Tuesday, next, July 20, 1954.

The plan is good. It deserves to live and not die.

The Mexico High School Dixie Grays Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, one of the happy features of the annual convention of the Lions International, meeting this year in New York City, was the invitation extended to high-school bands in various parts of the country to attend and participate in the convention program.

Among the bands which received the coveted invitation was the Dixie Grays Band, the famous high-school band of Mexico, Mo.

The band is under the experienced leadership of Mr. John Willer, band director of the music department of the high school. The trip is sponsored by the Lions Club of Mexico in cooperation with the State Lions organization, and is financed by the Lions with the aid of the Band Mothers Club, the A. P. Green Fire Brick Co., and the Mexico Refractories Co. The trip is under the capable direction of Mr. Robert H. Finley, former mayor of Mexico and vice president and general manager of the Northeastern Missouri Greyhound Lines, Inc., and adheres to a split-second schedule throughout.

The party, accompanied by Director and Mrs. Willer, Mr. and Mrs. R. C. Romdall, and Mr. and Mrs. Richard Kinne as chaperones, left Mexico the morning of July 4 and arrived in New York City July 6, where it played in Madison Square Garden for the opening of the Lions International convention and participated in the huge parade of July 7 down Fifth Avenue.

Most of the States of the Union were represented in the 30-block-long parade which also included bands from Alaska, Australia, Bermuda, the Bahamas, Canada, China, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Hawaii, British Honduras, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Bolivia, Chile, Portugal, Puerto Rico, Samoa, Sweden, Switzerland, West Indies, Tangier, and Venezuela.

The vast meeting, so efficiently timed and directed, served as a remarkable example of international cooperation and emphasized the worldwide interest in music and the cultural training of the young people of all lands in student organizations.

The band completed its New York schedule July 8 and is now en route home and is sightseeing in Washington today, where it is being entertained by Senator

SYMINGTON and the Senator's administrative assistant, Mr. Stanley R. Fike.

The personnel of the band and those accompanying it include: Rose Tratchell, Betty Martin, Donna Davis, Marilyn Morris, Linda Crump, Margaret Dickey, Nancy Harper, Judy Cooper, Dorothy Allen, Doris Harelson, Marjorie Farrah, Marjorie Merry, Judy Oiler, Barbara Durham, Jennie Norfleet, Mary Margaret Smith, Patsy Bonnell, Shirley Smith, Pricilla Aird, Donna Sapp, Betty Wray, Betty Payne, Glenda McIntire, Patsy Neal, Nina Harris, Marietta Tinsley, Warren Marinaccio, John Ferris, Hadley Stacey, Russell Sword, Jim Harrison, Gerald Keithley, John Precht, Charles Knox, Ronnie Curtis, James Clark, Jerry Romdall, Charles Inlow, Rogers Adams, John Bollinger, Kenneth Walker, Jim Kennedy, Richard Phillips, Ronnie Henderson, Larry Woodson, Larry Davis, Ned Dermody, Howard Hinze, Larry Niedergerke, Gordon Pitts, Donald Lotton, Ronnie Sapp, Larry Harvey, Donald Bonney, Carl Altrogge, Merrill Gates, Larry Kaizer, James Breneman, Jerry Shay, C. J. Phillips, Delbert Clark, Donald Smith, Kit Bond, John Hopkins, Jim Grainge, Olan Tratchell, Gary Singleton, Jim Atkinson, Donald Ayres, Bill Young, Ronald Hampton, Donald Hampton, Mr. and Mrs. John Willer, Mr. and Mrs. R. C. Romdall, and Mr. and Mrs. Richard Kinne.

Farm Surplus Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of the Nation will be glad to know that we recently passed the surplus-property disposal bill—S. 2475—which will increase the sale of our surplus farm commodities to foreign countries and help to relieve the depressing effect of farm surpluses overhanging the farmers' market.

The bill authorizes the President to use a \$1 billion revolving fund over the next 3 years to increase the sale of surplus farm commodities to foreign countries, and, when necessary, to accept local currencies of other nations, and also to barter farm commodities for strategic materials needed for the United States.

This legislation also permits the President to use \$300 million in the 3 years to furnish emergency assistance on behalf of the needy people of the United States, and to the free peoples of other nations, in order to meet famine and urgent relief requirements.

Thus, we are trying to dispose of a minimum of \$1,300,000,000 or more of surplus farm commodities now owned and stored by the Government.

This legislation should greatly increase sales and exports of agriculture commodities to foreign nations. It will help to remove the roadblock of trade between the United States and other free nations

by making it possible to accept their currencies during the period when they are short of American dollars. We, in turn, can use their currency with other nations in payment for import goods to our country or in payment for some of our military operations in foreign countries.

It further provides that these surplus farm products can now be sold on the world market, which is some less than our export prices, and it should greatly help in selling more farm products to the nations of the world.

This practical emergency approach in the interest of the farmers is the most advanced step yet any Congress has made to increase our export and sale of surplus products abroad. It is bound in time to be of great benefit to the farmers, as it will reduce our very large surpluses of farm products that are costing the Government tremendous sums for storage, and are depressing, here at home, farm prices.

Public Laws 424 to 436, Inclusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include my report on Public Laws 424 to 436, inclusive, to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois, as follows:

THIRTY-THIRD REPORT ON LEGISLATION OF THE 83D CONGRESS

DEAR FRIEND: Continuing where we left off:

PUBLIC LAW 424

S. 2657; unlicensed practice in District: Another District of Columbia measure, increasing the penalties for the unlicensed practice of the healing art.

PUBLIC LAW 425

S. 3050, tobacco marketing penalty increase: Tobacco growers asked Congress to crack down on cheaters who produce above their quotas while benefiting from price stability maintained by farmers who do cooperate. Public Law 425 increases to 50 percent (of the market price) the penalty on marketing in excess of quotas.

PUBLIC LAW 426

S. 2225, revested public lands in Oregon: This will interest you if I can tell it briefly. In 1866 Congress gave a generous land grant to the Oregon & California Railroad. In 1916 it revested the unsettled portion. This included 472,000 acres, all timberland, part within the boundaries of the national forests, and managed to conform with the perpetual sustained-yield program. Since 1925 there has been a jurisdictional dispute between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, now happily terminated by Public Law 426. The lands will continue to be administered by the National Forest Service, but receipts will go into a special fund, 25 percent covering cost of administration, 75 percent going to 18 Oregon counties. The law conforms with a 1954 decision of the United States Court of Appeals (D. C.) directing a payment of \$7 million in accumulated funds to the fortunate counties of Oregon.

PUBLIC LAW 427

S. 1004, rehabilitation of ex-convicts: This will permit the Commissioners of the District of Columbia under proper circumstances to employ deserving ex-convicts for whom the Board of Parole with difficulty is seeking employment in its rehabilitation program.

PUBLIC LAW 428

H. R. 8583, appropriations for executive offices: Appropriation measures will be covered in a separate and later report.

PUBLIC LAW 429

H. R. 1005, Fort Union National Monument, New Mexico: Old Fort Union, part of the glory of old of the Santa Fe Trail when the Great Southwest was growing up, is deteriorating rapidly, due to the elements, grazing cattle and other causes. Public Law 429 preserves the ruins of the historic fort by the establishment of a national monument. The Union Land and Grazing Co. will donate the land (1,000 acres) and the State of New Mexico will build and maintain a highway. Touring automobilists, jot down.

Old Fort Union is linked with the names of such heroes as Kit Carson, U. S. Grant, Robert E. Lee, Phil Sheridan, Longstreet. From 1851 to 1891 many young lieutenants fresh from West Point were broken in at Fort Union.

PUBLIC LAW 430

H. R. 3097, study of grape culture: For use exclusively for agricultural research (grape culture) Public Law 430 conveys to the University of California 20 acres of land in Napa County, Calif.

PUBLIC LAW 431

H. R. 2566, termination of Contract Settlement Act: This was signed by the President on June 28, 1954. It provides a cutoff date 180 days thereafter for filing of claims under the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, a measure waiving formal and technical defects in war contracts.

PUBLIC LAW 432

H. R. 3986, International Peace Garden: This increases the authorized appropriation for the International Peace Garden in North Dakota (2,100 acres on the American Canadian international boundary near the geographical center of North America) from \$100,000 to \$200,000. The peace garden is maintained by the North Dakota State Historical Society as a memorial to the peaceful relations between the peoples and Governments of the two countries. Canada bears its share of the cost.

PUBLIC LAW 433

H. R. 6173, Southern Ute Indian Trail: Southern Ute Tribe of Indians in Colorado, numbering 540 persons, have \$5,900,000 on deposit, settlement for tribal lands taken over by the United States. Public Law 433 authorizes, among other things, a \$1,000 per capita payment under the jurisdiction of the tribal council to enable the tribal members to improve and make more profitable their small farms.

PUBLIC LAW 434

H. R. 8357, 3/8-bushel basket: Housewives, please note. Public Law 434, urged by some fruitgrowers, legalizes a new size basket, one with a content of three-eighths of a bushel. Previously among the sizes legal under the Standard Container Act of 1928 there was an eighth bushel, a quarter, and a half bushel. Congressman PETER MACK, JR., of Illinois, a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, made a gallant but unsuccessful fight in committee and on the floor of the House against this measure. I voted with MACK. The difference between a three-eighths bushel basket and one with a half-bushel content would not be readily detected. Advice to the housewives in the Second District: Keep your eyes open; Public Law 434 has legalized a size with which

you have not been familiar. A bad law, I think. I am glad to have the opportunity in these reports of forewarning you; makes the labor entailed seem worth while.

PUBLIC LAW 435

H. R. 8456, Memorial Hospital at Gulfport: This conveys to the city of Gulfport, Miss., for use in the Memorial Hospital the dispensary of the Gulfport Naval Training Station no longer needed by the Armed Forces.

PUBLIC LAW 436

H. R. 8933 Coosa River development: It is said that the Coosa River in Alabama and Georgia is the second greatest undeveloped waterway in America. In 1945 the Rivers and Harbors Act provided a comprehensive plan for the development of the river by the United States Army Engineers. But Congress continued year after year to drag its feet in the way of necessary appropriations, just as it has been doing with Calumet-Sag.

Public Law 436, introduced by all Alabama Members of Congress including Senator SPARKMAN, permits private capital (Alabama Power Co.) to step in and do the job at an expenditure of \$100 million under the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission and checking by the Corps of Army Engineers.

The company first will build a flood-control dam, then other dams for hydroelectric power. Some, including your Representative were fearful of the measure as a dangerous precedent; finally reluctantly acquiesced because (a) immediate need of power for industrial growth and (b) bill had support of outstanding friends of TVA in both bodies.

Imports of Foreign Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, unless action is taken by the Congress or some power is exerted by the executive department of the Government, we will add to the present surplus of farm commodities a supply of oil commodities, and, in fact, have a tremendous surplus of oil commodities on hand now.

Time has proven that we should have passed legislation when it was before the last session of Congress to limit oil imports that are flooding the Nation, causing us to cut back and to continue to cut back our domestic productive

capacity, and at the same time crowding our storage capacity, which has brought about a situation where the pipelines are reducing their purchase of oil, in some instances, by 30 percent, which has caused a reduction of crude oil, in some instances, of 12 cents per barrel, and is throwing out of work thousands of men in southern Illinois and the Nation, many of whom will have to revert to unemployment compensation. Their earning power is stopped, and with it the taxes the Government would receive if these men could remain employed.

This condition has been brought about by a few American oil companies bringing in oil from the Middle East and other places, which is working a great hardship on the small independent operators as well as doing great damage to the economy of the various States and the Nation.

In 1949 imports of foreign oil averaged about 784,000 barrels a day. That is as much oil as should be permitted to come into this country daily at the present time, yet, these imports have increased to one million barrels of foreign oil a day.

It is the responsibility of the Congress and the executive department to use whatever means they have to reduce foreign oil imports at the earliest possible date, to a reasonable level.

Mr. Speaker, these excess imports have created a very serious condition in the oil industry in the entire nation. I have in my hand two telegrams recently received which I am including in the RECORD. These will give you some idea of the condition that has been brought about among the independent oil producers in my State of Illinois, and may I say, this same condition is present in Indiana, Kentucky, and generally among the independent producers, and major producers as well, throughout the Nation:

MOUNT CARMEL, ILL., July 21, 1954.

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The independent oil producers of Illinois met spontaneously this week at Fairfield, Ill., alarmed and much disturbed over the recent cutback or proration and reduction of price by two of the largest purchasers of crude oil in the basin. This gathering represented 50,000 barrels daily oil of the total 180,000 barrels produced in the State of Illinois. A committee of nine, including myself, was appointed to contact our rep-

resentatives in Washington, including the President, calling to their attention the alarming and serious situation confronting us.

I was likewise appointed chairman of a special committee from our Rotary Club for a mass meeting with other civic clubs and chambers of commerce who are disturbed along with farmers and land owners. The entire business of the State and Nation will be seriously affected unless some means of relief is immediately obtained to help this situation and protect us against import oil and import buyers flooding our market to the detriment of the entire Nation.

We here cannot be compared in many respects with Western States where they primarily have large ranches and leaseholds as compared with our small farms with low oil reserves and an average production of seven barrels per day per well in Illinois, and with the drilling of each well committing us to drill on the small adjacent farms to protect them against drainage, we certainly should not be called upon to stand proration. Under such circumstances, we cannot carry out our commitments and obligations under this proration and the condition can easily become disastrous.

I know that our representatives in Washington with the aid of the good offices of the President should be able to remedy this situation. The oil operators asked for 50 percent reduction in import oil instead of the steady increase which we have been getting, which will greatly relieve our serious situation and the present national economy.

If it would help our cause to show the seriousness of this present situation, you can be furnished with at least 100,000 immediate spontaneous signatures to telegrams, letters, or petitions showing that this entire community is up in arms and at the stage of demanding militant action.

The school boards have just informed me that this reduction will greatly decrease their tax revenue, thereby impairing the present building program to replace the now extremely inadequate school facilities.

J. ROY DEE,
Member of the Committee, of the
Combined Organizations of Oil
Producers.

CARMEL, ILL., July 23, 1954.

Congressman CHARLES W. VURSELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our local economy is seriously affected by recent curtailment of oil production. Fifty percent of local commerce is dependent upon the oil industry. We are not begging for subsidies of any kind, but are aware of the serious domestic results of imports of foreign oil. As representatives of the commerce, industry, and welfare of White County, we urge congressional action to curb imports of oil.

CARMEL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
GEORGE H. SCHANZLE, President.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 16, 1954

(Legislative day of Friday, July 2, 1954)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God Almighty, early in the morning our song shall rise to Thee. Only when our vision is cleansed and corrected by far horizons can we see the transient in the light of the everlasting. Without a sense of Thy presence in this

world of change and decay, fear of failure and of the unknown future haunts our hearts. Only at the springs of Thy abiding reality we keep alive our faith in values that are permanent and in the kindly light behind all shadows.

Send us forth to the duties of this day with serenity and calm to meet an agitated world with an unruffled kindness that is strength and an inner candor which is the courage of the soul. In the dear redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the

Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 15, 1954, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING
SENATE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, after consultation with the minority leader, I ask that the Subcommittee on Rules of the Committee on Rules and Administration be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.